THE

# Anabaptists Silenc'd;

OR, A

## Relation of a Publick Dispute

BETWEEN

JOHN TOMBS, B.D. Respondent,

AND

JOHN CRAGGE, and HENRY VAUGHAN, M.A. Opponents,

TOUCHING

# INFANT-BAPTISM,

In St. MARY's Church, in ABERGAVENNY, in MONMOUTHSHIRE.

Also a SERMON preach'd by Mr. CRAGGE, the SUNDAY following, upon MARK xvi. 16. wherein the Necessity of DIPPING is Refuted, and INFANT-BAPTISM asserted; occasion'd by a SERMON preach'd the Day before the Dispute, by Mr. TOMBS, upon the same Text.

---

The SECOND EDITION.

---

Printed in the YEAR MDCCXLI.

## To the READER.

*IN the Epistle Dedicatory to the first Edition of this Dispute, is inserted, by one Mr.* J. W. *the following Account of the Occasion of it.*

*Mr.* Tombs, *for several Months together, being importuned by Letters, and Messengers, came at length to water That, which Mr.* Miles, *Mr.* Prosser, *and others, had planted; or (as some think) to confirm a* * *Child lately baptized in* London. *When he entred the Pulpit, great Expectation was, What Mountains would bring forth. His Text was,* Mark xvi. 16. *From whence he concluded, That Infant-Baptism was a Nullity, a Mockery; That no Baptism, but by Dipping or Plunging, was lawful; That All, that would be saved, must be re-baptized, or baptized after Profession; That there was no such Thing as Infant-Baptism in the Primitive Times, but that it came in with other Corruptions, upon unsound Grounds; and challenged the whole Congregation to speak, if they had any Thing to say to the contrary. There were many learned Men that heard him; especially two, Mr.* Bonner, *a neighbouring Minister, and Mr.* Vaughan, *Schoolmaster of the Town, formerly a Fellow of* Jesus *College in* Oxford, *who both, for the present, kept Silence; only Mr.* Bonner *closed with him in the Way to his Lodging, and told him, That he had delivered some Things contrary to what he had read in the Ancients, and other Things, that grieved his*

* Tho', I suppose, of Age to give an Account of his Faith.

*Spirit to hear; and desired, therefore, to confer with him thereabout the next Morning. He slighted the grave old Gentleman, with as much Contempt, as* Austin *the Monk did the British Commissioners at* Bangor; *yet told him, that he would tarry in Town till such an Hour.*

*In the mean Time, the greatest Part of the People were offended, stagger'd, or scrupled; some not knowing what to think of their own, their Children's, and their Ancestors, Salvation.*

*The Anabaptists, that Night, and especially, the next Morning, triumph'd; saying, Where are your Champions now? Some of them are struck dumb, Others dare not shew their Faces, whilst Mr.* Tombs *is in Town; naming Mr.* Cragge, *another neighbouring Minister: The Report whereof being brought unto him he repaired instantly to the Town, and, meeting with Mr.* Bonner, *and Mr.* Vaughan, *they went all together to Mr.* Tombs, *where he was at a private House. Little was said there, by Reason of the Throng of People pressing in; but it was agreed upon, That they should meet in the Church, or Publick Meeting Place, at One o'Clock, which was accordingly done. Mr.* Tombs *took the Pulpit, the Opponents a Seat over against it: Mr.* Bonner *was preparing to give the Onset; but a Gentleman dissuaded him, by Reason of his Age, and bodily Infirmities, lest it should impair his Health; Mr.* Vaughan *began, Mr.* Cragge *succeeded; continuing the Opposition, betwixt them, for almost five Hours. When the Dispute was ended, Mr.* Cragge *was desired, by many godly Persons, to preach upon the same Text (which Mr.* Tombs *had preach'd upon) the Sunday following; which he did accordingly.*

## To the READER.

*I send you here inclosed the Sum of all; a Copy of Mr.* Vaughan's *Conference, which a Friend procured me from his own Hand; Mr.* Cragge's *Sermon and Dispute, I took from his own Mouth by Short-writing: You have the Disputations first then the Sermon; the Lord bless them to you, and you to his Glory, which shall be the Prayer of him, who is*

Yours to serve you in the

Lord Jesus,

J. W.

A

# A Relation of a CONFERENCE

*Had between Mr.* John Tombs, *B.D. and* Henry Vaughan, *M.A. in St.* Mary's *Church in* Abergavenny, *Sept.* 5, 1653, *touching* INFANT-BAPTISM; *briefly, and punctually set down to the Sense of Both.*

*V.* INFANTS may lawfully be Baptized; for they may be admitted into the Covenant of Grace now by Baptism, as they were before, and under the Law, admitted into the same Covenant by Circumcision.

*T.* I deny your Consequence.

*V.* You must deny it; either, First, because the Covenant of Grace, made with *Abraham*, and his Seed, is not the same in Substance with That which is now actually in Force with Believers, and their Children; or Secondly, because Baptism succeedeth not in the Room of Circumcision.

*T.* I could deny your Division: Yet I say, to gratify you, for both those Reasons.

*V.* For the former. That the Covenant made with *Abraham*, and his Seed, is the same which is now actually in Force with Believers, appears by comparing *Genes.* xvii. 2. with *Galat.* iii. 14. where it is clearly set forth, that the Promise made to *Abraham*, came unto the *Gentiles* through JESUS CHRIST.

*T.* Here he distinguisheth of a Twofold Seed of *Abraham*, the Natural, and Spiritual; and saith, that

that the Covenant was made with *Abraham*'s Spiritual Seed, and not with the Natural.

*V.* Even ALL the Children of *Abraham* were Circumcised, and, consequently, admitted into the Covenant, not ONE excepted; *for every Man Child* was to *be Circumcised*, *Gen.* xvii. 10. It appears by what happened to *Moses* for not Circumcising his Child, *Exod.* iv. 24. Even *Ishmael* was Circumcised, *Genes.* xvii. 23. who belonged not to the Promise, but was of the Natural Seed.

*T. Ishmael*, and the Natural Children of *Abraham* were admitted to theExternal Part, namely Outward Privileges, and Temporal Blessings, and not to the Internal, or Spiritual Part thereof.

By the Internal Part, he must needs mean That Part of it expressed, *Gen* xvii. 7. in these Words, *To be a GOD unto Thee, and unto thy Seed after Thee*; and, in the End of *verse* 8. *I will be their GOD.*

To justify this his Distinction, he referred us to *Rom.* ix. and, I think, *verse* 8. Where the Children of the Promise are contradistinguished from the Children of the Flesh, or the Natural Children of *Abraham*; so that the Covenant was made not to the Natural Children of *Abraham*, but to such of them as were Elect, and Faithful.

*V.* This Covenant was made alike, in the same Extent, and Latitude, promiscuously with ALL the Seed of *Abraham*; and Those that lost the Promise, and the Benefit of this Covenant, (which Men you call the Natural Seed) lost it not, because they were not at first comprehended in the Covenant, but because of their own Unbelief, *Rom.* xi. 20. I confess, That the Children of *Isaac* are, *Rom.* ix. called the *Children of the Promise*, not in Regard of any peremptory Election, or Designation to Faith, and Salvation,

vation, or, on the contrary, of any absolute Reprobation of the Seed of *Ishmael*.

For if it had been *Paul*'s Design to declare the Children of *Ishmael*, yea, the greatest Part of the *Jews*, to have been rejected by a certain absolute Decree, why should he, *v.* 1, 2. so much lament their Incredulity? wish himself accursed for their Sakes, *v.* 3. and *Rom.* x. 1. desire, and pray for their Conversion? since, upon such an absolute Decree of reprobating them, all that happened to them was inevitable.

But the Children of *Isaac* are called the Children of the Promise; First, because They only were to inherit the Land of *Canaan*; and, Secondly, because CHRIST, according to the Flesh, was to descend from the Progeny of *Isaac*, not of *Ishmael*.

I might have added, that if none, but the Elect, and Faithful, can be admitted into the Covenant, there is no Subject left for the Ordinance of Baptism, it being impossible for Man to know, who are Elect, Spiritual, and True Believers. Neither can you Baptise, with Right or Safety, all such Grown Persons as you Baptise, since you cannot be assured, That they are Elect, Spiritual, or True Believers, (*Rev.* ii. 17.) nor have you any Light to guide you, save that of charitable Opinion, and Conjecture.

Again, It being admitted, That none but the Spiritual, Elect, and Believing can be Baptised, First, The same Charity, that swayes your Judgment for Grown Persons, must much rather move you to hope the best of Innocent Infants, guilty of no actual Sin, since it Hopes all Things, and thinketh no Evil, 1 *Cor.* xiii. 5, 7. Secondly, they may have Faith *in semine & habitu*, in the Seed (as they have the Habit of Principles and Reason) tho' they cannot exercise it 'till Ripeness of Years. Thirdly, though they have not actual Faith, yet the Faith of their

Parents, may, and doth, put them into a Capacity of being admitted into the Covenant; nor is it News, That the Parents Faith advantageth the Children. *John* iv. 50.

*T.* I could wish you could prove, That Infants of Believers might be admitted to Baptism by Virtue of their Parents Faith.

*V.* They were admitted into the same Covenant by Circumcision, into which We are admitted now by Baptism; but Circumcision is *a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith*, *Rom.* iv. 11, 12. Whence it will follow, That either they had the Righteousness of Faith inherent in themselves, or That of their Parents imputed to them (chuse you whether); or else it will follow, That Circumcision was a false Seal.

T. It is not said there, That Circumcision was the Seal of the Righteousness of the Children's Faith, but only of *Abraham*'s own Faith, in particular.

*V.* But the Covenant, or Promise, was the same, and alike, to *Abraham*, and his Seed, *Rom.* iv. 13. *Gen.* xvii. 7. and alike to Us, Believers, and to our Children, *Acts* ii. 39.

This Truth appears yet further, from 1 *Cor.* vii. 14. where we find, That the Faith of either of the Parents makes the Children holy; at least, in that Degree of Holiness (which is the meanest imaginable) of being in a Capacity of being admitted into the same Covenant with their Parents.

T. The Scope of the Apostle here, is to satisfy a Scruple of the Corinthians, *viz.* whether the Believing Yoak-fellow might live in the Enjoying and Use of the Unbelieving Yoak-fellow? he resolves them in the Affirmative, saying, The Unbelieving Husband is sanctified in (as 'tis in the *Greek*) or TO (not FOR, or BY) the Wife, *&c.* That is, he

may

may lawfully uſe, and enjoy her, and ſhe him—— and their Children Holy, that is, Legitimate.

*V.* But here is, certainly, ſome Special Priviledge ſet forth to the Children of Believers, accruing to them from the believing Parents. Beſides, it had been no News to tell them they might have the lawful Uſe of one another, and that their Children were Legitimate, and no Baſtards. For where Both, Husband, and Wife, were Unbelievers, no Man ever doubted, but their Enjoyment of one another was lawful, and their Iſſue Legitimate.

*T.* The Caſe is meant, where both Parties at their Enterance into Marriage were Unbelievers, but afterwards, one of them happens to be converted, whether Then they might Cohabit, and enjoy the Uſe of one another?

*V.* Tho' this were granted, (which I ſhall not contend about) yet the Apoſtles Senſe cannot be of the lawful Uſe, and Enjoyment of each other; for the Word Ἡγίασται, Sanctify'd, never denotes to be lawful. Or, if ever you ſhew me, That ἅγιος, which is render'd Holy, ſignifies Lawful, I ſhall urge no further.

*T.* There is that Acceptation of the Word, 1 Tim. iv. 4, 5. *Every Creature of God is good, and not to be refuſed, if it be received with Thankſgiving; for it is ſanctified (ἁγιάζεται) by the Word of God, and Prayer:* Here, *ſanctified*, is ſet for *lawfully uſed*, as ſtanding in Oppoſition to That which is Refuſed.

*V.* The Senſe is, That ſuch Uſe of the Creature is pleaſing to God, as acknowledging him the Author and Sender; for ſuppoſe a ſinful Man eat his Meat, without invoking GOD for a Bleſſing, hath he not a lawful Uſe of the Creature?

*T.* His next Inſtance was, 1 Theſ. iv. 3, 4, 7. where *Sanctification* is uſed for *Chaſtity*, and might bear that Senſe in this Place, 1 Cor. vii. 14.

*V.* I

*V.* I deny it, for Sanctification is there used in its full Latitude as appears by the Context.

But I will descend to prove the Second Ground of my Consequence, at the Beginning, which you denied, viz.

That *Baptism* succeedeth in the Room of *Circumcision*. Col. ii. 11, 12.

Mr. Tombs had told us, that That was impossible; for then Women should not be Baptized, because they were not Circumcised, [which is *Bellarmine*'s Argument.] To which I answer'd, 1st. That indeed the Males only were mentioned in the Covenant of Circumcision; for in the Eyes of all Laws whatsoever, the Women are but as ignoble Creatures; and therefore the usual Stile of Laws, and Covenants is, *Si Quis*, and *Qui*, in the Masculine Gender, except such as particularly respect their Sex.

2*dly*. That they are included in the Word Seed; and, because descended from Man, did partake of the Privilege, and Promise, annexed to the Covenant. I thought also to have told him, That I well knew, that before Christ's Time, Baptism AND Circumcision were BOTH practised on the *Proselytes*, called *Proselytæ Justitiæ*; (as I could have shewed out of several Authors) yet, That hinder'd not, but that Baptism, now under the Gospel, should be the SOLE Means to admit us into the same Covenant, into which the *Jews* were admitted by Circumcision. Even as the Bread and Wine were taken by the *Jews* at the eating of the Passover, and now, that the *Jewish* Passover is abrogated, the Bread and Wine were only by

by Christ retained to commemorate his Passion, the True Passover. 1 *Cor.* v. 7, &c.

And in like Manner, when Circumcision was abolish'd; yet, was Baptism retained to admit the Infants of Christians, as Circumcision admitted Them of the *Jews*: But the Time, and his close Manner of Disputing, not permitting this Enlarging, by Recourse to the Original, and Institution of Baptism, which served more to illustrate than to convince, I kept to the Tether allowed; and came, at Length, to prove, That Proposition from *Col.* ii. 11, 12. Where, 1*st*. The Circumcision of Christ, is set in Opposition to the *Jewish* Circumcision, made with Hands. 2*dly*. An Explanation of what is meant by the Circumcision of Christ, in these Words, being *buried with him in Baptism.*

T. *Paul* here dissuades them from the Use of *Jewish* Ceremonies, (which some would have introduced amongst them) and particularly of Circumcision; because all these were but Shadows, but the Body, and Reality, was of CHRIST.

V. 'Tis confessed, the Apostle speakes here against Imposers of *Jewish*, and also *Pythagorean*, Doctrines, and Practices.

But see ye not here a Double Circumcision? And the Circumcision of CHRIST described, by being *buried with him in Baptism?* The Word *buried*, implieth but the Resemblance betwixt CHRIST's Death, and Resurrection, with what is done in Baptism; where there is an Immersion, or Plunging in the Water, to shadow his Burial, and an Emersion, or Rising up out of the Water, to represent his Resurrection; which Resemblance is more fully set forth, *Rom.* vi. T. Here

T. Here Mr. Tombs interrputed me, and desired the People to take Notice of my ingenuous Confession; That Baptism was then practised by Plunging. He read also a Passage out of Casaubon's *Annot. on the New Test.* where he saith, That Βαπτίζειν, to *Baptise*, denoteth a Plunging of the whole Body, &c. Had he read OUT the Passage, he might have found, how That great Scholar affirms this to be a slender Argument against such as only Sprinkle at Baptism; for, saith he, the Virtue and Efficacy of Baptism consists not in That; meaning, the Manner of Washing.

V. I shall satisfy the Auditor's herein anon; in the mean Time, I desire an Answer to my Argument, viz. the Analogy between Circumcision and Baptism, so evident in this Place.

But receiving None, I address'd myself to the People, according to Promise; saying, That, indeed, it seemed to me, that for some Centuries of Years, Baptism was practised by Plunging: For Sprinkling was first brought in Use by Occasion of the Clinicks, (as Cyprian, *Epist. ad Magnum*, relates) being Men which deferred their Baptism 'till some Extremity of Sickness; who then, in such Case, were only Sprinkled with Water, lest the Plunging of their Bodies might over-offend them in that Feeble, Desperate Condition.

T. Here take Notice that Sprinkling took its Rise from a corrupt Custom.

V. Though Plunging be confessed the more ancient Way, yet is this no Ground for that over-uncharitable

charitable Speech of your's, in your Sermon Yesterday, viz That our Baptism, meaning of Infants, and by Sprinkling, was but a Nullity, and Mockery, which concludes ourselves, and Ancestors; yea, ALL in the Western Church, for 1500 Years, under Damnation.

For the Church hath Power, upon the Sight of any Inconvenience, and for Order and Decencies Sake, to alter the Circumstantials, and Externals of any Ordinance.

T. What! have they Power to alter any Thing from the Form of Christ's Institution?

*V.* That they have such Power is confessed by all Divines, and he is none that denies it; yea, I believe, it is acknowledged by your own Practice.

T. Wherein?

*V.* In the Administration of the Lord's Supper, which was done by CHRIST in the Evening; and also, THEN, by his Apostles, after their Love-Feasts: Whereas the whole Church of GOD (and yourself, I suppose) take it in the Morning; which Custom hath taken Place, and obtained every where for very many Ages, even from their Days, who immediately succeeded the Apostles.

Thus (advising him to be Wise to Sobriety, and to cease to embroil the Church of GOD (so infinitely torn already) and to submit to the Judgment, and almost uninterrupted Practice of the Western Churches, even for 1500 Years; To which GOD's Providence could not be so far wanting, as to suffer them to fall into such an Error of admitting and retaining a Baptism, which, in his Account, was none) we broke of.

*Had*
*a*
*ry*
*in*

for
qu
sit
Bu
Inf

# A Relation of a DISPUTE

*Had between Mr.* John Tombs, *B. D. Respondent, and Mr.* John Cragge, *M. A. Opponent, in St.* Mary's *Church, in* Abergavenny, Sept. 5, 1653, *touching* INFANT-BAPTISM.

MR. CRAGGE, having briefly expressed that he was forced to undertake this Task on a Sudden, and unprovided against so experienc'd a Champion, desired, First, if he should fail, the Cause might not suffer Prejudice in Men's Opinions for his Sake.

2. That Liberty might be granted of a premeditate, and treatable Dispute, not doubting, that if he should but Study the Question, so many Hours, as Mr. TOMBS had done Days, so many Days, as he had done Weeks, so many Weeks, as he Months, or so many Months, as he Years, the Truth was so evident on his Side, he would not fear (in Spite of all Opposition) to make it clear. In the mean Time, trusting to GOD's Assistance, (whose Cause it was) he would attempt it; beginning with this Enthymema.

C. Some Infants may NOT be Baptized; therefore, some Infants MAY be Baptized.

T. Having repeated, he denied the Consequence.

C. Which he proved thus: Subcontrary Propositions, in a Contingent Matter, may be both true; But these, *viz.* *Some* Infants may *not* be Batized, *some* Infants *may* be Baptized, are Subcontrary Propositions

in a Contingent Matter: Therefore they may be both true.

T. Having repeated the Syllogiſm, he ſaid, there were four Terms in it.

C. He enquired where?

T. He anſwered, In theſe Words, MAY be both true, in the Premiſes, and, ARE both true, in the Concluſion.

C. He anſwered, that was Mr. Tombs Syllogiſm, none of his, reciting that Diſtict of *Martial*;

*Quem recitas meus eſt, O Fidentine, logiſmus,*
*Sed male dum recitas, incipit eſſe tuus.*

T. Repeating it over again after him, ſaid, That he ought to have brought in the Concluſions, AND both true.

C. Which he took away thus; That which proves the Thing denied, is ſufficient: But that Subcontrary Propoſitions, in a Contingent Matter, MAY be both true, proves the Thing denied, That *ſome Infants may not be Baptized, ſome Infants may be Baptized:* Therefore it is ſufficient.

T. He denied the Minor, tho' it be an Axiom, Subcontrary Propoſitions in a Contingent Matter may be both true; yet, it was not Conſequent, that Theſe Subcontrary Contingent Propoſitions, viz. Some Infants may *not* be Baptized, ſome Infants *may* be Baptized, may be both true.

C. Which was proved thus: That, which is affirmed and predicated of the Species, may be, and is, affirmed of every *Individuum*, and Particular, under that Species; But it is affirmed of the Species, That Subcontrary Propoſitions in a Contingent Matter may be Both true: Therefore, it may be affirmed of Theſe particular Propoſitions, *viz.* Some Infants may *not* be Baptized, ſome Infants *may* be Baptized, That They may be Both true.

T. He

T. He ſaid, it was a Fallacy, he went about to entrap him, in confeſſing, That Subcontrary Propoſitions, may be both true, where the Subject is Capable; but here, the Subject (to wit Infants) are not Capable of Baptiſm.

C. Then replies he, THEY are not Contingent, (which is here required) but Neceſſary Propoſitions *in materiâ neceſſaria*, if the Subject be not Capable; but we ſpeak of Contingent Propoſitions, the Predicate whereof may be affirmed, or denied, of the Subject without Contradiction; which, while he was framing into a Syllogiſm,

T. Mr. T. interrupted him, ſaying, what would the Man ſay, if he could ſpeak?

C. You love not to hear Truth ſpeak, but would ſtrangle it in the Birth, like the *Egyptian* Midwives; but to give you further Satisfaction, I will prove, That they are actually BOTH true, eſpecially, That ſome Infants *may* be Baptized; for, of the Other, there is no Controverſy: Which he did thus, To whom belongs the Eſſence of Baptiſm, they may be Baptized; but to ſome Infants belongs the Eſſence of Baptiſm; therefore, ſome Infants may be Baptized.

T. He denied the Minor, That the Eſſence of Baptiſm did belong to ſome Infants.

C. Which was proved thus; To whom belongs the Definition of Baptiſm, to them belongs the Eſſence; but to ſome Infants belongs the Definition of Baptiſm; therefore, to ſome Infants belongs the Eſſence of Baptiſm.

T. He anſwered, Firſt, to the Major, *viz* To whom belongs the Definition of Baptiſm, to them belongs the Eſſence; ſaying, It was *idem per idem*, proving of the ſame Thing by the Same.

C. To which was reply'd, why then ſays *Ariſtotle*, that ὁρισμὸς ἐστὶ τῆς οὐσίας λόγος, the Definition is

a

a Manifeſtation of the Eſſence; and Logicians deſcribe a Definition, to be *explicatio rei Eſſentiæ*, the Expreſſion of the Eſſence of a Thing; now, THAT which expreſſes a Thing; and WHICH IS expreſſed, are Two diſtinct Things. Then he denied the Minor, which was proved thus:

C. The Definition of Baptiſm, as of all other Relations, is made up of the Fundament, Correlative, and *Termini*: But all theſe Three, *fundamentum, correlatum, & terminis*, belong to Infants; therefore the Definition of Baptiſm belongs to Infants.

T. He denied the Major, That Baptiſm was a Relation, or was made up of thoſe Ingredients.

C. He reply'd, That ſeemed ſtrange to him, ſeeing ALL the Divines, and Logicians, that he had read, affirmed Baptiſm to be a Relation; and it was evident, it could be put in no other Predicament, (as might be proved by Induction, but that the People underſtood it not) ſeeing the whole Nature of Baptiſm is πρὸς τὶ, in Relation to another.

T. He ſaid, he cared not for Authorities, but bid him prove it.

C. Which he did thus; Every Sacrament is a Relation; but Baptiſm is a Sacrament: Therefore Baptiſm is a Relation.

T. He ſaid, he might deny both Propoſitions; Firſt, the Major; becauſe, for any Thing he knew, every Sacrament was not a Relation; and the Minor too, that Baptiſm was a Sacrament, for the Word Sacrament, was an Invention of Man, not grounded upon Scripture.

C. Which both Propoſitions together, were prov'd thus; That which is an Outward, and Viſible Sign, of an Inward, and Inviſible Grace, is both a Relation, and a Sacrament; but Baptiſm is an Outward, and

Viſible

Visible Sign of an Inward, and Invisible Grace: Therefore it is both a Relation, and a Sacrament.

T. He denied the Minor, That Baptism was an Outward, and Visible Sign, of an Inward, and Invisible Grace.

C. He told him, it was St. *Austin*'s Definition, avouched by learned Men in succeeding Ages; confirmed, and approved, by the Church of *England* in the old Catechism.

T. Mr. *T.* said he look'd for Artificial, or Divine Arguments, not humane Testimonies; at which Answer, while Mr. *C.* seemed to be astonished, he took Occasion to triumph, contumeliously, saying, he never heard *such* an Argument.

C. To which he replied, Nor did *Alexander* ever *see* such a Knot, as the Gordian, which made him cut it, when he could not untie it. You teach me, by Experience, to know, That there is no Disputing against them, that deny all Principles: For where you think the People do not understand, you make no Scruple to deny clear Truths in Logick, and Divinity: Therefore, I see, I must go to plain Scripture, that all the People may understand the Absurdities: Now, That the Definition of Baptism (which was the Thing denied) belongs to Infants, I prove thus:

If GOD instituted Baptism for Infants, CHRIST merited it for them, and they stand in Need of it, Then, to Infants belongs the Definition of Baptism: But GOD instituted, CHRIST merited, and Infants stand in Need of Baptism: Therefore, to Infants belongs the Definition of Baptism.

T. He denied the Minor, That GOD did institute Baptism for Infants, that CHRIST did merit it for them, or Infants stand in Need of it.

C. Which

C. Which he promised to prove in order; First, That GOD did institute Baptism for Infants. He that appointed Infants Church-Members Under the Gospel, did institute Baptism for them; but GOD appointed Infants Church-Members under the Gospel; therefore, G O D did institute Baptism for Infants.

T. He said, First, the Major might be questioned; because to be Church-Members, and to be Baptized, were not *termini convertibiles.*

C. He confessed it; for Infants, under the Law, were Church-Members, and yet not Baptized, but Circumcised; and before the Law, Church-Members, and yet, neither Circumcised, nor Baptized; but under the Gospel they were so convertible, that ALL that were Baptized, were Church-Members, and ALL that were Church-Members were to be Baptized; which is, that which he affirmed now, and is a Truth so clear, that Mr. Tombs confesses it all along in his Books, and upon That confessed Ground, Mr. *Baxter* goes in many of his Arguments.

T. He would have denied it, 'till a Gentleman told him, That he heard him affirm the Same in his Sermon the Day before: Then he denied the Minor, That G O D did institute Infants Church-Members under the Gospel.

C. That I'll confirm, says he, with a Threefold Cord, which will not easily be broken; Before the Law, Under the Law, and Under the Gospel; which he framed into an Argument thus; Those, whom GOD did promise Before the Law, fore-tell Under the Law, actually receive into Covenant Under the Gospel, Those GOD did appoint Church-Members under the Gospel; but GOD did promise Before the Law, fore-tell Under the Law, and actuall receive Infants intoCovenant Under the Gospel: Therefore, GOD did appoint Infants Church-Members under the Gospel.

T. He

T. He denied the Minor, That GOD did promiſe before the Law, fore-tell under the Law, and actually receive Infants into Covenant under the Goſpel.

C. Which was proved in Order; firſt, That GOD did promiſe Before the Law, that Infants ſhould be in Covenant Under the Goſpel, thus,

That, which GOD did promiſe to *Abraham*, was Before the Law; but GOD did promiſe to *Abraham*, That Infants ſhould be in Covenant Under the Goſpel: Therefore GOD did promiſe Before the Law, that Infants ſhould be in Covenant Under the Goſpel.

The Minor being denied, he proved it out of Gen. xvii 7. *I will eſtabliſh my Covenant between me, and thee, and thy Seed after thee, in their Generations, for an everlaſting Covenant, to be a God unto thee, and unto thy Seed after thee*, Thus framing his Argument; He that made an Everlaſting Covenant with *Abraham*, and his Seed after him in their Generations, promiſed, That Infants ſhould be in Covenant under the Goſpel; but GOD made an Everlaſting Covenant with *Abraham*, and his Seed after him in their Generations: Therefore GOD promiſed, that Infants ſhould be in Covenant under the Goſpel.

T. He denied the Major, ſaying, That *Everlaſting* There, ſignify'd only a *Long Time*; not that it ſhould be ſo under the Goſpel to the World's End; and was to be interpreted by the Verſe following, *I will give unto thee the Land of* Canaan *for an Everlaſting Poſſeſſion*; and yet, the *Jews* are now diſpoſſeſſed of *Canaan*.

C. They are Now Diſpoſſeſt, but ſhall be poſſeſſed of it again, at their Converſion, and ſo have an Everlaſting Poſſeſſion, in the Type, to the End of the World, in the Antitype, for Ever: But that the Covenant, that GOD made with *Abraham*, is

to

to continue to the End of the World, appears, in that it is a Gospel Covenant: That, which is a Gospel Covenant, is to continue to the End of the World; but the Covenant, that GOD made with *Abraham* and his Seed to all Generations, is a Gospel Covenant, *Gal.* iii. 8. *And the Scripture foreseeing, that GOD would Justify the Heathen through Faith, preached the Gospel before to* Abraham, *saying, In thee shall all Nations be blessed*; Therefore, it is to continue to the End of the World.

T. Without repeating, he confusedly answered thus; That it was an Everlasting Covenant, and to continue to the End of the World; but NOT to Infants.

C. He told him, first, That it was a Denying of the Conclusion; Then he took away his Answer, thus, If GOD commands Infants to stand before him in Covenant, then it is to continue to Infants; But GOD commands Infants to stand in Covenant before him: Therefore it is to continue to Infants. Deut. xxix. 10, 11. *Ye stand this Day, ALL of you, before the Lord your God, your Captains of your Tribes, your Elders, and your Officers, with ALL the Men of* Israel, *your LITTLE ONES.*

T. He said, That he should have proved, that it should continue to Infants to the *World's End*; for he did not deny, but that Infants, in some Sense, were in Covenant under the Law, but not under the Gospel.

C. Yes, under the Gospel; for if CHRIST hath obtained a more excellent Ministry, and is a Mediator of a better Covenant, which is establish'd upon better Promises; Then, if Infants were in Covenant under the Law, they are in Covenant under the Gospel; But *Heb.* viii. 6. CHRIST hath obtained a more excellent Ministry, was a Mediator of a better Covenant, which was establish'd upon better

better Promiſes, therefore, if Infants were in Covenant under the Law, they are in Covenant under the Goſpel.

T. He denied the Conſequence of the Major, That tho' the Covenant of the Goſpel was a better Covenant than That of the Law; yet, Infants were not in Covenant, as well under the Goſpel, as under the Law.

C. Which was thus taken away; That which Unchurches the one half of Chriſtendom, and leaves them no ordinary Means of Salvation, cannot be a better Covenant; But to deny Infants to be in Covenant, Unchurches the one Half of Chriſtendom, and leaves them no ordinary Means of Salvation: Therefore it cannot be a better Covenant.

T. Without Repeating the Syllogiſm, or Denying either of the Premiſſes, or formally applying any Diſtinction, he ſaid, The Covenant under the Goſpel was made only with the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*.

C. Which was thus diſprov'd; If the Covenant was made in the ſame Manner, and Extent, with the *Gentiles*, as with the *Jews*; then, under the Goſpel, it was, not *only* made with the Spiritual Seed; But it was made in the ſame Manner, and Extent, with the *Gentiles*, as it was made with the *Jews*: Therefore, under the Goſpel, it was not *only* made with the Spiritual Seed.

T. He denied the Minor.

C. Which was proved by this Enthymema: The Partition Wall is pull'd down, and *Jew* and *Gentile* are all One in CHRIST JESUS: Therefore, the Covenant is made in the ſame Manner, and Extent, to the *Jew*, and to the *Gentile*.

T. He denied the Conſequent; That, tho' the Partition Wall was taken down, and Both, *Jew* and *Gentile*, are all One in CHRIST JESUS, ſee-

ing the Gospel was offered to all Nations; yet, under the Gospel, the Covenant was *only* with the Elect, and True Believers.

C. Which was confuted thus; That, which is made with the Whole Visible Church, is not *only* made with the Elect, and True Believers; But the Covenant is made with the Whole Visible Church: Therefore, not *only* with the Elect, and True Believers.

T. He denied the Major.

C. Which was proved thus; That, which is made with the Kingdom of GOD upon Earth, is not *only* made with the Elect; But, That, which is made with the Whole Church visible, is made with the Kingdom of GOD upon Earth: Therefore, it was not *only* made with the Elect.

T. He denied the Major; that That, which was made to the Kingdom of GOD upon Earth, is not *only* made with the Elect.

C. Which was proved thus; In the Kingdom of GOD, that is, in the Church Militant, there are, not *only*, Elect, but Reprobates, Saints, but Hypocrites; for ALL, that are Outwardly called, are of the Kingdom of GOD, in this Sense, and *Many are called, but Few chosen.* The Kingdom of GOD is compared to a Field, where there are Tares, as well as Wheat; to a Fold, where there are Goats, as well as Sheep; to a Nobleman's House, where there are Vessels of Dishonour, as well as of Honour. And, if the Church, in Regard of Outward Administration of Ordinances (which is the Question) were *only* the Elect; then it would follow, that there never was a Visible Church upon Earth; the *Jews* had no more Visible Church than the Heathens; the Distinction of the Church Visible, and Invisible, were Frivolous; for no Man, nor Angel, knows who are Elect, nor Any, but GOD.

To

To which Iſſue, the firſt Branch of the Argument being brought, Mr. *C.* referred the Judgment of it to the People, and proceeded to the Second; That GOD foretold under the Law, That Infants ſhould be Church-members under the Goſpel.

Mr. *T.* perceiving, That the People apprehended, That he was brought to an apparent Abſurdity, would have waded into a large Diſcourſe to wind himſelf out.

But Mr. *C.* told him, That it was his Office (being Reſpondent) to Deny or Diſtinguiſh, but not, authoritatively, to determine the Queſtion, as if he were the *Doctor* of the *Chair*; and, with much ado (the Anabaptiſts crying, Let him have Liberty to ſpeak) brought him to diſpute again, and to turn to *Iſai.* xlix. 22.. Whence Mr. CRAGGE framed this Argument:

C. He that foretold, That he would lift up his Hand to the *Gentiles*, and ſet up a Standard to the People; and that they ſhould bring their Sons in their Arms, and That their Daughters ſhould be carried upon their Shoulders, foretold, that Infants ſhould be Church-members under the Goſpel: But thus ſaith the LORD GOD, *Behold, I will lift up my Hand to the* Gentiles, *and ſet up my Standard to the People, and they ſhall bring thy Sons in their Arms, and thy Daughters ſhall be carried upon their Shoulders:* Therefore GOD foretold, that Infants ſhould be Church-members under the Goſpel.

T. He denied the Major; and ſaid the Meaning was, That the *Jews* ſhould bring the *Gentiles* Children.

C. To which he reply'd GOD ſays, I will lift up my Hand to the *Gentiles*, and They, that is,

the *Gentiles*, ſhall bring thy Sons; and Mr. TOMBS ſays, the *Jews* ſhall bring thy Sons. Then a Gentleman read the Words, and ſaid, It is the *Gentiles* ſhall bring, *&c.*

T. Then Mr. *T.* recollecting himſelf, ſaid, the meaning was, The *Gentiles* ſhould bring the *Jews* Children from Captivity; And that it did not point at the Time of the Goſpel.

C. To which was replyed; The Contents of the Chapter ſays, That it points at the Time of the Goſpel; Mr. TOMBS ſays, it points at the Time of the *Jews* Captivity; whether ſhall we believe? and repeated the Contents: CHRIST, being ſent to the *Jews*, complaineth of them, to the 5th Verſe; he is ſent to the *Gentiles*, to the 13th Verſe; GOD's Love to his Church, to the End: Then the People laughed, *&c.*

The Pith of which, was framed into an Argument, thus; That, which is the Judgment of the Church of *England*, ought to be entertained before the groundleſs Aſſertion of one Private Man; But that it points at the Time of the Goſpel, is the Judgment of the Church of *England*: Therefore it ought to be entertained before the groundleſs Aſſertion of one Private Man.

T. He denied, That it was the Judgment of the Church of *England*.

C. Which was thus proved; If the Church of *England* cauſes it to be Printed, and commands it to be Read before the Chapter, then it is the Judgment of the Church of *England*; but the Church of *England* cauſes it to be Printed, and commands it to be Read before the Chapter: Therefore, it is the Judgment of the Church of *England*.

T. Mr. *T.* ſaid, It was not commanded to be Printed, and Read ſo before the Chapter; for he knew not what Kind of Bible his was.

C. He

C. He told him; It was the ſame with the great Church Bible, which was, not only, authorized with a Proclamation, but with an Act, almoſt, fifty Years ago; and will Mr. Tombs, (ſaid he) without giving a Reaſon, condemn a whole Nation to have ſlept in ſuch an Error all that While? Then Mr. *Abbets*, Preacher-reſident there, One who had been dipped, being in Pulpit with Mr. Tombs, ſtood up, and ſaid; the Words were, They ſhall bring *thy* Sons in *their* Arms; To which Mr. *C.* replied, what then? May they not be GOD's Sons by Adoption, and their own by Natural Generation?

Mr. Tombs fell upon expounding the Chapter from Verſe to Verſe. Mr. *C.* told him, That they came not to hear him Expound, but Diſpute; and, repeating the laſt Argument, wiſhed him to anſwer: At which, Mr. *Abbets* ſtood up again, and ſaid, The Words of the Text were, That *they*, that is, the *Gentiles*, ſhall bring *thy* Children, that is, the *Jews*. To which Mr. *C.* replied, That is an Addition to the Text; for there is no mention of the *Jews*; But grant it were, muſt it be, therefore, meant of the Captivity; the 20 and 21 verſes of this Chapter confute it, intimating, That the *Jews*, after CHRIST's coming, ſhould loſe their own natural Children, and that the *Gentiles* Children ſhould be adopted, and engrafted into their Place; *They*, that is, the *Gentiles* converted, ſhall bring *thy* Sons; Thine, by a Kind of Adoption, and Spiritual Succeſſion; for the *Gentiles* Children, were ingrafted into the Stock of the *Jews* Children broke off; And this is ſo clear from the Context (compared with *Rom.* 11.) That, with Reaſon, it cannot be denied; and added, That he was to ſpeak to Mr. Tombs, who underſtood the Nature of a Diſpute, and not to him; and if he would take upon him to Moderate, it was fit, that he ſhould have another.

T. Mr.

T. Mr. Tombs asked Mr. C. What he underſtood by Standard, what by Kings, what by Nurſing-Fathers, &c.

C. He told him, That it was not his Place to diſpute Socratically, by asking of Queſtions, but to anſwer *ad Appoſitum*. But to give him Satisfaction (which he needed not) by Standard, he underſtood ſome Viſible Goſpel-Ordinance, as Baptiſm, &c. by Kings, Supream Magiſtrates; by Nurſing-Fathers, and Nurſing-Mothers, Patrons, and Protectors of the Goſpel.

T. He ſaid, That it was a Metaphorical Speech; and that nothing could be gather'd from it.

C. He reply'd, That he would grant him, that it was more than a Metaphorical Speech; (for a Metaphor conſiſted but in One ſingle Trope) but that it was a Continuation of ſeveral Tropes; and therefore, Allegorical; yet, it did not follow, that nothing could be gathered from it; for then, nothing could be gathered from any Parable in the Goſpel; nay, nor from any Part of the New Teſtament; for there is ſcarce a Sentence without ſome Tropes in it.

T. Mr. T. ſaid, It was fulfill'd in *Heſter*'s Time, who was a Nurſing-Mother to the *Jews*.

C. To which was anſwered; *Heſter* was a *Jew*, and a Friend to the *Jews*; what is this to the *Gentiles* Bringing Children upon Shoulders? And tho' That ſhould be waved, and *Heſter* granted to be a Nurſing-Mother, in the Type; yet, in the Antitype, it aims, principally, at the Times of the Goſpel; elſe, groſs Abſurdities would follow; for what Kings or Queens, in *Heſter*'s Time, did bow down to the *Jews* with their Face towards the Earth, and lick up the Duſt of their Feet? *v.* 23. Iſles are ſummoned, in the 1ſt Verſe, which muſt be meant of the Time of the Goſpel: CHRIST is promiſed to be given for a Light to the Gentiles, that he may be their

their Salvation to the End of the Earth, *v. 6.* Kings ſhall ſee, and ariſe, Princes alſo ſhall worſhip, *v.* 7. And the Holy Ghoſt, quotes *verbatim*, and applies, to the Time of the Goſpel, the 8th *v.* and that expreſly, 2 *Cor.* vi. 2. There is an implied Cutting off of the Jews, *v.* 20. An Ingrafting in of the Gentiles, the Children of the Wild Olive, into the Stock of the Natural Olive, *v.* 21. And a Bringing of Children to Viſible Ordinances, *v.* 22. All which, he offered to frame into Arguments.

T. But Mr. T. prevented it, ſaying, That though it ſhould be underſtood of the Times of the Goſpel; yet, by *Sons in Arms*, and *Daughters upon Shoulders*, was meant Grown Men, for any Thing he knew, and Men, and Women of a Hundred Years of Age, might be carried upon Arms, and upon Shoulders.

Which, indeed, is the ſame Anſwer Mr. *T.* gives in his ſceptical Exercitation; (like Foxes, and Badgers, being beat out of one Hole, have another to fly into): Where (as Mr. *Huſſey* quotes him) he uſes the ſame Words, Mr. *Abbets*, and he found Fault with, in Mr. *C.* Major Propoſition; for theſe are his Words; *It is foretold, That the* Gentiles *ſhould bring* their *Children in* their *Arms: Therefore the Prophet foreſaw the Baptiſm of Infants.* He might have ſeen the Beam in his own Eye; *turpe eſt doctori*, &c. But to return to Mr. *T.* Anſwer.

C. Which Mr. *C.* took thus away; Them, that they ſhould bring in their Boſoms, were Infants; But it was foretold, That they ſhould bring them in their Boſoms; Therefore they were Infants.

T. He

T. He enquired, Where it did appear, That they ſhould bring them in their Boſoms.

C. Out of the Text, for the Word, in the Original, (which is tranſlated Arms) is Boſom; and ſo the Septuagints read it, ἐν κόλπῳ, intimating, That they ſhould bring ſucking Children, hanging upon their Breaſts.

T. Then Mr. Tombs ſaid, It was an Analogy, and performed, when the Gentiles perſuaded their Children to embrace CHRIST.

C. Well then, It is *their* Children, not *thy* Children, *Oportet eſſe Memorem*; But not That neither; for that Scripture, which, in the Letter, ſuits with *many other* Scriptures, but, in the pretended Analogy, with *no* Other, cannot be the Meaning; But, to interpret it *literally*, of *Bringing* Children to CHRIST in the *Boſom*, ſuits with *many* Scriptures; and, to *perſuade* them to *come* to CHRIST, with *no* Scriptures; Therefore, it cannot be the Meaning.

T. Mr. T. could not name one Text of Scripture, where, to bring in Arms, or Boſom, was to *perſuade* to *come* to CHRIST.

C. So Mr. *C.* referred the Judgment of it to the People, and named another Text, *Iſ.* lxv. 20. *There ſhall be no more, thence, an Infant of Days*, &c. *But the Child ſhall die an Hundred Years old.*

T. Mr. *T.* bid him read the Reſt of the Words, and the Verſe following.

C. He ſaid, he had read as much, as he intended to raiſe his Argument from.

T. Take Notice (ſays he) he will not read That which makes againſt him.

C. Not ſo; for Nothing of it makes againſt me; but that an Argument muſt be *terminus ſimplex*, and *homogeneal*; and That you know well enough, but that, in Place of ſolid Satisfaction, you muſt ſay Something

ſomething to deceive the People. The Arguments I ſhall riſe from hence, are Two. The Firſt is This; There ſhall be no more an Infant of Days; that is, Infants ſhall not be Uncapable of the Seal, while their Age is meaſured *by Days*; as the *Jews* Infants, who might not be Circumciſed, 'till a Week had paſſed over them: Therefore, Infants, New-born, are Capable of the Seal: The ſecond Argument is This; The Child ſhall die an Hundred Years old; that is, *as* an Hundred Years old; or, as well a Church-member, *as if* he were a Hundred Years old: Therefore, Children may be Baptized under the Goſpel.

T. Mr. *T.* found Fault with that Interpretation, *viz. as if* an Hundred Years old.

C. He anſwered; To take it literally, would imply a Contradiction; for it was impoſſible to be a Child, *and* a Hundred Years old; and that it was better than His, and the Anabaptiſt's Expoſition of 1 *Cor.* x. 2. *And were all Baptized in the Cloud*, that is (ſay you) *as if* they were Baptized in the Cloud, when nothing hindred, but they *were really* Baptized in the Cloud; and of *Rom.* xi. 19. *The Branches were broken off*. That is (ſay you) *as if* they were broken off, when it was both poſſible, and apparent, that they *were* broken off.

T. Then Mr. *T.* ſaid, It was not meant of the Times of the Goſpel.

C. To which was replied, Mr. *T.* will ſtill be Wiſer than the Church of *England*; and read the Contents of the Chapter; The Calling of the *Gentiles*, *v.* 1. The *Jews* rejected, *v.* 17. The bleſſed State of the new *Jeruſalem*, to the End.

T. Mr. *T.* ſaid it was verified, *Zacha.* viii. 4, 5. *Thus ſaith the Lord of Hoſts, there ſhall yet old Men, and old Women dwell in the Streets of* Jeruſalem, *and every Man with his Staff in his Hand for very Age,*

 *and*

*and the Streets of the City shall be full of Boys, and Girls, playing in the Streets thereof.*

C. To which was replied, What is this to an Infant of Days, or a Child dying a Hundred Years old? when it is apparent, both from the Contents, and Text, that This of *Zachariah*, is meant of the *Jews* Return from Captivity; and more apparent, that That of *Isaiah* is meant of the State of CHRIST's Kingdom under the Gospel; which I prove thus: That Interpretation, which brings with it Absurdity, Untruth, Blasphemy, is not to be admitted; But to interpret it of the *Jews* Return from Captivity, brings with it Absurdity, Untruth, Blasphemy: Therefore, it is not to be admitted.

T. Mr. Tombs denied the Minor.

C. Which was proved in Order; First, That it brought with it Absurdity; But to apply the 25th *verse* to the Return from Captivity was absurd, *viz.* That *the Wolf, and the Lamb* should *feed together, and the Lion* should *eat Straw with the Bullock, and Dust* should *be the Serpent's Meat:* Therefore, it brought with it Absurdity. Secondly, That it brought with it Untruth; But to apply the 19th *verse* to the Return from Captivity brought with it Untruth, *viz.* That *the Voice of Weeping* should *be no more heard in* Jerusalem; for it was twice *destroyed* after That, once by *Antiochus*, then by *Vespatian* and *Titus:* Therefore it brought with it Untruth.

Thirdly, that it brought with it Blasphemy; for to interpret the 17th *verse*, *Behold, I create new Heavens, and new Earth, and the Former shall not be remembred, nor come into Mind*, of the second Temple, is Blasphemous: Therefore it brought with it Blasphemy; for it crosseth St. *Peter*'s Interpretation, 2 *Pet.* iii. 13. *We, according to his Promise, look for new Heavens, and a new Earth:* For can any

any rational Man think, that the new Temple built at *Jerusalem* in *Cyrus*'s Time, was this new Heaven, and new Earth, and that the Former should not be remembred? When many of the ancient Men are said to weep, because the Glory of the latter Temple was Short of the Glory of the First, *Ezra.* iii. 12. For it was Inferiour to *Solomon*'s Temple, First, in Respect of the Building, that was lower, and meaner; Secondly, in Respect of the Vessels which were, before of Gold, but now, of Brass; Thirdly, In Respect of five Things that were lost; First, the Ark of GOD; Secondly, The *Urim* and *Thummim*; Thirdly, Fire from Heaven to consume the Sacrifices; Fourthly, the Glory of GOD between the Cherubims; Fifthly, the Gift of Prophesy: For after the second Temple, there was no Prophet.

T. Mr. *T.* fell to his wonted Course of impertinent Exposition, wherein, Mr. *C.* told him, he violated the Rules of Dispute, and did lasciviously wanton it out into a Wilderness of Words, that the Truth might be obscured, or lost; and, like a Lapwing, carry the Hearers far from the Matter. Then *C. P.* an Apothecary began to interpose, as he had done once before; 'till a Gentleman of Authority, told him, That it was not fit for a Man of his Place, and Calling to speak; Yet, Mr. Tombs would not be satisfied, but went on, saying, That Dr. *Prideaux* in *Oxford*, when a Place of Scripture was cited, was wont to give a large Exposition.

C. Mr. *C.* replied, That Dr. *Prideaux* was *Doctor* of the *Chair*, and Judge of the Controversy, and might do That, which a Respondent may not do;

 whose

whoſe Office is, only to Repeat, Deny, Diſtinguiſh, and, when a Text is quoted, to give a Brief Expoſition, that the Opponent may have ſomething to faſten upon; But what Dr. *Prideaux* did, he knew not; but what Dr. *Collins*, and Dr. *Ward* did, he could tell him; but that it was not to the preſent Purpoſe. And that his Judgment in This, was but the Same with his own Univerſity of *Oxford*, as he knew, of late, by a ſad Experiment.

T. Mr. *T.* asked what That was?

C. He told him, an Exploſion; not for Diſability (for his Diſpute was plauſible enough) but that he would neither be ſatisfied with Dr. *Salvage*'s Anſwer, nor with the *Doctor* of the *Chair*'s Determination; but fell to Repetitions, and Extravagancies, as now.

Mr. TOMBS launched into a tedious Diſcourſe to vindicate himſelf, 'till he had tired the Auditors, who cried out, This is, but to waſte Time; and a Gentleman ſpake aloud, This is, but to ſpend the Time in Parling, that he may avoid the Gun-ſhot; for he is afraid the great Thunderbolt is behind: And ſo, with much ado, he was brought to diſpute again; when Mr. *C.* Falling upon the third Branch of his Argument, *viz.* That GOD did actually receive Infants to be Church-members under the Goſpel, began thus.

C. Thoſe, whom CHRIST commanded his Diſciples to Baptize, They may be Baptized; But CHRIST commanded his Diſciples to Baptize Infants: Therefore, they may be Baptized. The Minor, being denied, was proved thus; He, that commanded his Diſciples to Baptize all Nations, commanded

commanded them to Baptize Infants; But CHRIST commanded his Disciples, *Matt.* xxviii. 19. to Baptize all Nations: Therefore, CHRIST commanded them to Baptize Infants.

T. Mr. *T.* denied the Major.

C. Which was proved by this Enthymema; the Whole includes every Part; Infants are a Part of Nations: Therefore, he that commanded to Baptize ALL Nations, commanded to Baptize Infants.

T. He denied the Consequent, tho' the Whole included every Part, and Nations were the Whole, and Infants were a Part of Nations; yet it did not follow, that Infants were to be Baptized.

C. He returned, that That Saying of *Aquinas*, *posito toto generali, pars ejus negari non potest, a general Whole being granted, no Part of it can be denied*, was an Axiom, both in Logick, Philosophy, and Divinity; as *Ps.* cxvii. 1. *Praise the Lord all ye Nations*, is interpreted by another *Psalm*, *Old Men, and Babes, Young Men, and Maidens, praise ye the Lord.*

T. Mr. T. Said, It was an Axiom, That the Whole includes every Part, where there is no Exception, but here is an Exception.

C. He replied, St. *Ambrose*, upon the Place, says, there is no Exception, *Qui dixit OMNES, nullos exclusit, neque parvulos*, &c. *He that said, Baptize ALL Nations, excepted none, no, not Infants.*

T. Mr. T. slighted St. *Ambrose*'s Authority.

C. Then said Mr. C. Whether shall we obey, *Ambrose*, Bishop of *Millain*, with Scripture, or Mr. Tombs, Vicar of *Leominster*, against Scripture? judge ye. But that there is no Exception, I prove thus; If Infants be excepted from Baptism, it is, either, because they are not named in the Text, or because we find no Instance that any were Baptized,

or

or becauſe they are not Capable; But for none of theſe three: Therefore, Infants are not excepted.

T. Mr. T. denied the Major, and ſaid, That a fourth Reaſon might be given, *viz.* Becauſe they were not Diſciples.

C. He told him, That, in this Anſwer, he ſhew'd himſelf to be no good Logician; for it is an Axiom, That, in no Diviſion, one Member can be affirmed of another, becauſe they are Oppoſite; now to be Diſciples, and Capable of Baptiſm, were not Oppoſite, but Subordinate; And to be Diſciples, if it made them *not* Capable, it was no Exception at all; if it *made* them Capable, it was the ſame with the Third. To which *Dilemma*, when he could receive no Anſwer, he demanded, where was it required, That thoſe, that are to be Baptized, muſt be Diſciples?

T. He ſaid, out of the Text; for That, which is tranſlated, *Teach all Nations*, is μαθητεύσατε, *make Diſciples* of all Nations.

C. He replied; at *Roſs*, you found Fault with me for that Tranſlation, asking me, was I wiſer than the Tranſlators? and now, when it ſeems to make for you, you urge it. *Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo?* I confeſs it is μαθητεύσατε, in the AORIST, *Ye ſhall make Diſciples*; for it muſt be interpreted by the Future, βαπτίζοντες, *Baptizing*, or, *by Baptizing*, in the Preſent Tenſe, as if *Diſcipling* were the End, and *Baptizing* the Means, and required no Qualification before, (as learned Men, with great Probability, preſs) but I will not inſiſt upon That now: But That, which you denied, I prove, *viz.* That Infants may be Diſciples from that Place, *Rom.* xv. 10. compared with the 5th *v.* for ſo Mr. C. ſaid, Miſtaking it for *Acts* xv. 10.

T. At which Mr. Tombs inſulted, ſaying, he was a good Text-man.

C. He

C. He replied, he was in Haste, and did not think of this before, but that his Answer drove him to it; and that *He*, in his *elaborate* Books, did, oftentimes, quote one Place for another; then, how much more might he, that was *extemporal*? It had been enough to have said, as our Saviour said to the Tempter, *It is written:* But, to leave these Catches, and come to the Proof: They, upon whom the *Pharisees* would have laid the Yoak, were Disciples, *v.* 10. *Why tempt ye GOD, to put a Yoak upon the Neck of the Disciples*: But many of them were Infants: Therefore, Infants are Disciples.

T. He denied the Minor, *viz.* That many of them were Infants.

C. Which was proved thus; The Yoak was Circumcision, for *v.* 5. the *Pharisees* said, *That it was needful to Circumcise them*; But They, upon whom the Yoak was to be imposed *by* Circumcision, were *only* Infants amongst the *Jews*, and Infants, together with Parents, amongst the *Gentiles*; Therefore, many of them were Infants.

T. He denied the Major, and said, the Yoak was *not* Circumcision.

C. He reply'd, It was apparent, by comparing the 5th and 10th *Verses* with the foregoing *Verses*. In the 1st *v. Certain Men, which came down from* Judea, *taught the Brethren, except ye be Circumcised, after the Manner of* Moses, *ye cannot be saved.* Where, observe, That Circumcision is the Subject of the Question. In the 2d *v. They determined, that* Paul, *and* Barnabas, *and certain others of them should go up to* Jerusalem *unto the Apostles, and Elders, about this Question*; *to wit*, Circumcision. In the 5th *v. Certain of the Sect of the Pharisees* said, *That it was needful to Circumcise them.* In the 6th *v. The Apostles came together to consider of this Matter*; that is, Circumcision; *And when there had been much disputing*

*disputing*, Peter *rose up* in the 7th *v.* and determined the Question in the 10th. *Why tempt ye God to put a Yoak upon the Neck of the Disciples?*

T. Mr. T. said, That Circumcision could not be the Yoak, which neither They, nor their Fathers, could bear.

C. He returned, That it was a Bloody, and a Heavy Yoak; therefore, the *Israelites* had a Dispensation from it for forty Years in the Wilderness; *Moses* neglected the Circumcision of his Child, probably, for this Cause; and his Wife (when the Child was Circumcised) called him a Bloody Husband. The *Sichemites* were slain, as Unable to defend themselves, while they were sore of the Wound of Circumcision.

T. Mr. T. said, That the *Doctrine of Moses*, was the *Yoak*, of which, Infants were not Capable.

C. He replied; That *Circumcision* was principally meant, and the Doctrine of *Moses* was only an Appendix of it; and Children were as Capable of the Doctrine *then*, as they were in the Times of *Abraham*, and of *Moses*; when ALL, in the Moment of Circumcision, were tied to the Observation of the Doctrine; tho', they of Ripe Years (to use *Vossius*'s Distinction) were *taught* the Doctrine *antecedenter*, *before Circumcision*; Infants, of eight Days, *consequenter*, *after Circumcision*, when Age made them Capable; I *know* (says GOD) Abraham *will teach his Children*; So that it is apparent, that ALL those, upon whom Circumcision, with the Doctrine of *Moses*, was to be imposed, were called Disciples; But *some* of these, were Infants, for *only* Infants were Circumcised among the *Jews*, and Infants, with the Parents, among the *Gentiles*; Therefore, some Infants are Disciples.

Mr. T. Without any distinct Answer, would have broke thro' the Pales, to rove abroad again.

C. But

C. But he preſſed him to keep within the Liſts, urging this Argument; They, to whom is the Promiſe, may be Baptized; it's the Apoſtle's Own Inference, *Acts* ii. 39. *Be Baptized—for the Promiſe is to You*; But to Infants of Believing Parents is the Promiſe; *The Promiſe is to you, and to your Children*: Therefore Infants may be Baptized.

T. He denied the Minor, *viz.* That to Infants of Believing Parents is the Promiſe.

C. He told him, it was the Words of the Text, *The Promiſe is to you, and to your Children.*

T. Then Mr. T. ſaid, They were not Believers yet.

C. Mr. C. replied, they were Believers *in fieri*, tho', perhaps, not *in facto.*

T. That's Latin (ſays Mr. T.) what do you mean by it?

C. He ſaid, I mean This, That they were Believers by Outward Aſſent, and Diſpoſition, ſufficient to make them Members Viſible; but, perhaps, not Believers by Inward Aſſent, and Habit, to juſtify them. For I know, you will not ſay, that none are to be Baptized, but they that have a Saving Faith; which none, but GOD, is able to diſcern. Miniſters muſt act according to Rule, which, in *adultis*, is Outward Profeſſion, or a Willingneſs to receive the Ordinance; and that *they* were thus qualified, (which is ſufficient) it is apparent.

Then Mr. T. denied, that they were ſufficiently qualified.

C. Which was proved thus; They, whom the Apoſtle commanded to be Baptized; were ſufficiently qualified; But the Apoſtle commanded them to be Baptized: Therefore, they were ſufficiently qualified.

T. Then Mr. T. without Repeating the Syllo-

gism, or applying any Distinction, enquired, where did the Apostle command them to be Baptized?

C. He told him, *verse* 38. Βαπτισθήτω ἕκαστος ὑμῶν, *be Baptized every one of you.*

T. Yes, (says Mr. *T.*) Upon Condition of Repentence; *repent* and be Baptized.

C. That is a Condition of your own Making, and an Adding to the Word of GOD; for where does the Scripture, either expresly, or impliedly, say, That Repentance is a Condition of Baptism? If it be meant of Compleat Repentance, true it is, It was their Duty, both to Repent, and to be Baptized; to Repent, in Relation to CHRIST crucified; to be Baptized, in Relation to Judaism, which they were to put off, and to Christianity, which they were to put on; But that they must have Compleat Repentance before Baptism, it is not so much as hinted at. And if you mean Incompleat Repentance, (which is, indeed, all that is required) they had That already; For *they were pricked in Heart*, saying, *Men, and Brethren, what shall we do?*

T. Mr. *T.* Said, That was not all, that was required, nor was it a sufficient Qualification for Baptism.

C. Against which Answer, it was concluded thus; That, upon which the Apostles Baptized three Thousand the same Day, was a sufficient Qualification; But the Apostles, upon That, Baptized three Thousand the same Day: Therefore, it was a sufficent Qualification.

T. He denied the Minor, and gave his Reason from the 40. and 41. *Verses, And with many other Words did he testify, and exhort, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward Generation. Then they, that gladly received his Word, were Baptized.*

C. Mr.

C. Mr. *C.* replied, That this was but a Recapitulation, or Reciting the Heads of *Peter*'s Sermon, which he had preached to them, before they were pricked in Heart, or were exhorted to be Baptized, and no new Act; which was a Thing usual in Scripture, as *Gen.* i. GOD, having expressed the Creation of Man, and GOD's Blessing of him, and all Creatures to him, by a ὕστερον πρότερον, recites the Manner of his Creation in the second Chapter. But howsoever, it made nothing against Him; for, whether it be taken *thetically*, without any Condition, or *hypothetically*, upon Condition, of Repentance, the Children were to be Baptized together with the Parents; *the Promise is to you, and to your CHILDREN*; and That was all, that he contended for: From whence says he, ariseth this Argument; To whom the Promise of Grace belongs, to them Baptism belongs also; but the Promise of Grace belongs to Believers and their Children: Therefore, Baptism belongs to Both.

T. Mr. *T.* said, the Promise of Grace belonged to Believers, and their Children, when their Children actually *believed*, and not before:

C. He replied, There were two Arguments in the Text to overthrow That: The First might be drawn from the Indicative Predication in the present Tense; *the Promise IS to you, and to your Children*; IS, for the present, as well, to your Children, as to you. The Second, from the Opposition betwixt *you* and *your* Children, and *them that are afar off*: *They, and their Children*, which are, τὸ ἐγγὺς, *near*, (as the *Greek* Scholiast, and the *Syrian* Interpreter says) are opposed to *them that are*, εἰς μακρὰν, *afar off*. The *Jews* were Near, and in Covenant; for to them *IS* the Promise, in the present Tense; but the *Gentiles* were afar off, *Eph.* ii. 13. *Ye, who sometimes were* afar off, *are made* nigh *by the*

*the Blood of CHRIST*: Therefore it is expressed in the Future Tense, *as many as GOD* shall *call*; So that, to the *Jews*, *being* called, Their Children were in Covenant with them; when the *Gentiles shall* be called, Their Children shall be in Covenant with Them.

T. Mr. *T.* said, He granted, That Children were in Covenant, and might be Baptized.

C. Well then, observe, Good People, the Dispute is at an End; he grants, That Children are in Covenant, and may be Baptized.

T. Yes, but by these Children are not meant Infants, but Grown Men.

C. He replied, There are many Circumstances in the Text to overthrow That; First, the Word is, τέκνοις, which comes from τίκτω, to *bring forth*, given, sometimes, to Children in the Womb: for the most Part, to them that are Newly-born, or Young.

T. Mr *T.* said, it was also given to Men of Ripe Age.

C. Yes, sometimes, by a figurative Speech; as That of *Julius Cæsar* to *Brutus* in *Plutarch*, καὶ σὺ τέκνον, *and thou my Child*. And well might he call him his Child, for he had *adopted* him the Night before; but, properly, it signifies a young Child: And so it ought to be taken here, (unless some convincing Reason can be given to the Contrary) according to that Rule, *Omne analogum per se positum, stat pro famosiore significato.*

Mr. T. gave no Answer, but, with a jeering Eccho, repeated the last Words, *pro famosiore significato.*

The second Circumstance in the Text, is the Substantive Verb, ἐστὶ, *is*; *the Promise is to you, and to your Children*; not; IS to you, and SHALL be

be to your Children: Now, What Children had they, at this Present, but young Children? unless Mr. T. will imagine, that they were all Old Men and Women, that were Present, and that their Younger Men and Women were Absent.

The third Circumstance in the Text, is the *finis cui*, the End to WHOM; the Promise is to you, and to your CHILDREN. The *Jews* Children, under the Law, were in Covenant with their Parents; the Charter is confirm'd under the Gospel to Them and their Children. The *Jews*, when they crucified CHRIST, called for a Curse upon Themselves, and upon their Children; here the Apostle gives them a Remedy, as large as the Disease; *The Promise* (that is, of Freedom from the Curse) *is to you, and to your Children.*

T. Mr. T. still kept his Conclusion, in Spite of the Premisses: *viz.* That it was to their Children, when they actually believed, and not before.

C. Yes, and *before* they actually believed, which I prove thus: The Blessing is as large as the Curse; But the Curse extended, even to Children, *before* they could actually Believe; *His Blood* BE [*NOW*] *upon us, and upon our Children:* Therefore the Blessing.

T. Mr. Tombs answered to the Major, thus: If, by Blessing, was meant the *inward* and Spiritual Part of the Covenant, it might be true; but That was nothing to the present Purpose, seeing, it was not known to us: But, if the *outward*, and Visible Part, he denied, that Infants were Capable of the Blessing, as well as Liable to the Curse.

C. Which Distinction was taken away, thus: They, that are *Holy* with a Covenant-Holiness, are Capable of the *Outward* and Visible Part; But Infants of Believers are Holy with a Covenant-Holiness; Therefore, they are Capable of the Outward and Visible Part.

T. Mr.

T. Mr. T. denied the Minor, and ſaid, That Covenant-Holineſs was a *Gibberiſh*, which they, that ſpoke it, did not underſtand themſelves.

C. Mr. *C.* replied, It was the Language of Learned Men in all Ages; amongſt whom, were *Voſſius*, *Bullinger*, and *Hugo Grotius*; and that Children of Believing Parents were Holy *before* Baptiſm; and that Baptiſm did not *make*, but *declare* them to be Chriſtians.

*Then cry'd out* I. E. *a Cobler, (who had been Dipped) This is Blaſphemy.*

C. Well, you diſcover of what Spirit you are, and your Ignorance: Are not theſe the Words of the Learned Aſſembly of Divines, in the *Directory*, confirmed by Ordinance of Parliament? *viz.* That Infants are Chriſtians, and Fœderally Holy *before* Baptiſm, and *therefore* are they baptized, *Pag.* 12. And that Infants of Believing Parents, are thus Holy, with a Fœderal, or Covenant-Holineſs, I thus prove from 1 Cor. vii. 14. *Elſe were your Children Unclean, but now they are* Holy.

T. That, ſays Mr. *T.* is meant of Matrimonial-Holineſs, or a Lawful Uſe of the Marriage-Bed, *viz.* That they are no *Baſtards*.

C. That Anſwer, I thus infringe. That, which, in Scripture, is taken, almoſt, Six Hundred Times, in a diſtinct Senſe, and not ſo much as *once* for Matrimonial-Holineſs, cannot be ſo meant here; But it is taken in Scripture, almoſt, Six Hundred Times, in a diſtinct Senſe, and not Once for Matrimonial-Holineſs: Therefore, it cannot be ſo meant here.

T. That Argument (ſays Mr. *T.*) I will Retort upon you; That, which in Scripture, is taken Six Hundred Times in a diſtinct Senſe, and never *once* for Covenant-Holineſs, cannot be meant ſo here; But it is taken Six Hundred Times in a diſtinct

Senſe,

Sense, and never once for Covenant-Holiness; Therefore, it cannot be meant so here.

C. To which was replied; This is to invert the Order of the Dispute, you are to Answer, and not to Oppose.

T. I may Oppose, by Retorting of an Argument, and I will answer anon.

C. Well, to satisfy you, I deny your Minor; for it is often taken in Scripture for Covenant-Holiness.

T. Where?

C. The Proof lies upon *you*, that it is *not*; yet, I will give you one Instance, or two, Rom. xi. 16. *If the First Fruits be Holy, the Lump is also Holy, and if the Root be Holy, so are the Branches.*

T. That is not meant of Covenant-Holiness.

C. Yes, and That as clear as the Light; and so you yourself interpreted it at *Ross*, as there are hundreds that will witness; and which was on this Occasion. I pressed, that, if the *immediate* Parents were Holy, the Children were Holy, with a Covenant-Holiness; you denied the Inference, and said, the Meaning of it was, that *Abraham*, the Father of the Faithful, was the First Fruits, and Root, that was Holy; and therefore, his Posterity was Holy, and in Covenant.

(And in this Exposition, as he agreed with Truth, so with *Beza*, who says, that Children are Holy; *that is*, Comprehended in Covenant from the Womb; and with *Bowles*, who saith, that they are Holy with Outward Holiness, by which they are judged to be in Covenant.)

But to return from Whence, by your Retortion, we have digressed, I am to prove, that Holiness is never taken in Scripture for Matrimonial Cleanness, in Opposition to Illegitimation. Not in that Place,

Place, *Ezra*. ix. 2. *The Holy Seed have mingled themselves with the Seed of those Lands*; which is, either your Only, or Principal Hold, (as far as I can gather out of your Books) Therefore, in no Place.

T. He denied the Antecedent.

C. Which was proved thus: If it be meant of Matrimonial Cleanness, then This must be the Meaning of the Words; The Holy Seed, *that is*, Lawfully-Begotten *Jews*, have mingled themselves with the Seed of those Lands, *that is*, the *Bastards* of those Lands: But That cannot be the Meaning; for, haply, there *were some* Bastards among the *Jews*, and, in that Sense, not Holy; and NO Bastards among the Nations, but ALL, or the MOST Legitimate; and therefore, in that Sense, not Unholy; Therefore it is not meant of Matrimonial Holiness.

T. He denied the Major, affirming, That both *Jews*, and *Nations*, were Holy before their Mixture; but *then*, both they, and their Children became Unclean; because, GOD had forbidden them to marry with the Nations.

C. To which was answered; They, that are Saints, are not Unholy; But some Saints have been begot by this Mixture, or unlawful Bed, as *Jephtha*, who, *Heb*. xi. Is said to be justified by Faith: Therefore they are not Unholy.

T. He denied the Major; saying, They may be Unholy by their Natural Generation, and First Birth; and yet, Holy by Regeneration, and New Birth.

C. This strikes not Home: *Moses* had Children by his *Ethiopian* Woman; but they were not Illegitimate; Therefore, those, that were begotten by Mixture with the Nations, were not Illegitimate.

T. Mr. T. Said, That was before the Law was given.

C. Well,

C. Well, That Anſwer will do you but little Service: After the Law was given, *Solomon* had Children by *Rahab*, who was a *Canaaniti*ſh, and *Boaz* by *Ruth*, who was a *Moabiti*ſh, Woman; and yet, they were not Illegitimate, or Unholy, as you would have them.

T. They became Proſelytes, and received the Religion of the *Jews*.

C. Well then; While they were *not* of the *Jews* Religion, tho' *no* Baſtards, they were *Un*holy; when they *embraced* the *Jews* Religion, (by your own Confeſſion) they became Holy. What is This, but a Covenant-Holineſs, which you have oppoſed all this While, and now, grant it?

Mr. T. uſed many Words to clear himſelf, but with little Satisfaction to the greateſt Part of the Hearers; and ſtill denied, That Children were Holy, and in Covenant.

C. Which was farther proved thus: They, whom CHRIST took up in his Arms, Bleſſed, and ſaid, The Kingdom of GOD belonged unto them, pronounced a Curſe upon thoſe, that Deſpiſed, and would not receive them, are Holy with a Covenant-Holineſs; But CHRIST took up Little Children in his Arms, Bleſſed them, and ſaid, The Kingdom of GOD belonged unto them, Pronounced a Curſe upon thoſe that Deſpiſed, and would not Receive them: Therefore, Little Children are Holy with a Covenant-Holineſs.

T. Mr. Tombs began to be Nettled, as if ſomething in this Argument Galled him; ſaying, it was a Fallacy, and that he went about to entrap him by Sophiſtry.

C. What Fallacy?

T. A Heaping of many Things together, that belong to ſeveral Matters.

C. I confeſs, they were ſpoken upon ſeveral Occaſions; but they all concenter in my Concluſion, viz. That Children are Holy, and in Covenant: I am in Haſte, and have named them all together; but, if you will have Patience, I'll proſecute them ſeverally.

T. I am willing to continue 'till Midnight; but I like not this Kind of Arguing.

C. You like it not, becauſe it does *jugulum petere*, *cut the Throat of your Tenet.*

T. No, not ſo much as touch the Skin of it.

C. Well, I beſeech you, in the Spirit of Meekneſs to anſwer.

T. It is a Fallacy of Heaping many Particulars together.

C. I Confeſs, there is a Fallacy they call πολυζήτεσις.

T. Take Notice, he confeſſes it is a Fallacy.

C. No ſuch Thing; for πολυζήτεσις, is an Asking of many Queſtions, which is your uſual Fallacy, Socratically to Ask, when you ſhould ſolidly Anſwer; but in my Syllogiſm, there is not ſo much as one Queſtion.

T. It is a Copulative Propoſition, ſays Mr. *T.* and if *one* Member of it be falſe, the *whole* is Falſe.

C. It is not an *explicit* Copulative Propoſition, (ſays Mr. *C.*) neither is *any* Member of it Falſe; for every Branch of it is Scripture. Inſtance in any of the Particulars, that you think, makes the Leaſt for me, and I'll begin with That. Then he mention'd *Matt.* xviii. 2, 3, 4. The Words being read, he raiſed from them this Argument. They, to whom belongs the Kingdom of Heaven, are Holy, and in Covenant; But to Little Children belongs the Kingdom

dom of Heaven; Therefore, Little Children are Holy, and in Covenant.

T. Those Little Children were not Infants.

C. They are called βρέφη, of βαρῶς ἔπειν, because they could scarce speak.

T. What, are *these* called βρέφη?

C. If not Here, elsewhere, and of other Evangelists; and Here, they are called παιδία, by the Diminutive, which the great Master of the *Greek*, *Hippocrates*, interprets, to signify a Child under seven Years of Age; and therefore, not Capable of actual Faith, when the Apostles themselves were yet Ignorant about Fundamentals.

T. They were converted, *verse* 3. *Except ye be converted, and become as Little Children*, &c.

C. The Meaning is not, That the Little Children were converted; but it hath Relation to the Disciples in the First *Verse*, who must be converted from their actual Sins, and become *as* Little Children, who have *no* actual Sin.

T. *O* how unhappy are the People, that are seduced with these Toys! are you not ashamed?

C. I see, you have learned of that Man in *Lucian*, to cry out ὦ κατάεγτε, and to vilify that Argument you cannot answer; and, besides That, see Nothing, that is Shame-worthy.

> He hath answered nothing at all, (says one under the Pulpit) but Shifts, and denies, all.

T. Thou art an Impudent, Brazen-faced Fellow, whosoever thou art; I have answered All, Confuted all my Adversaries Books, and amongst them, One of my greatest *Antagonists*, Mr. *Richard Baxter*; the most of whose Arguments, I have turned against himself:

C. Sir, let that worthy Man alone, who is absent, you are now to answer me.

T. Here is nothing to answer, unless it is the sixth *Verse*; *Whoso shall offend one of these Little ones, which* believe *in me*; were they not *Believers*?

C. Yes, the Disciples were Believers; which are here meant, and not the Children; which the Grammatical Construction will tell you; for it is in the Masculine Gender; *ΕΝΑ τῶν μικρῶν τούτων*, ONE *of these Littles Ones*, meaning, *μαθητὴν*, Disciple; not in the Neuter Gender to answer to *παιδίον*, Little Child; so that my Argument remains unanswered.

T. I am weary of this Pedantry; and, looking upon his Watch, said, I promised but One Hour, and it is above four Hours. With That, he clapped his Book together. Good Mr. TOMBS, (says *T. J.* an Anabaptist) continue a little longer for Satisfaction to the People: He gave no Answer, but put on his Hat.

C. Well, Sir, I will not press you any further Now: I should have urged *John* iii. 5. *Rom.* xi. and other Places, to prove Infants Church-membership; and (having come to the Second and Third Branches of mine Argument) That CHRIST merited it for them, and Infants stand in Need of Baptism; but these I must leave to another Opportunity: Therefore, I desire, that we may have a Set-day about a Month hence, seeing I was hurried to this *extemporal* Discourse, through Importunity.

T. No, I will have no more Dealing with you, unless it be by Writing, that what both of us shall set down, may be read in the Publick Congregation.

MARK

## MARK xvi. 15, 16.

*And he said unto them, Go ye into all the World, and Preach the Gospel to every Creature.*

*He that believeth, and is Baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned.*

THESE two Verses hold out the rich Charter of the Gospel, which our Saviour delivered to the Apostles after his Resurrection. The Parts are Two; First, a Precept, in the former Verse; *Go ye into all the World, and preach the Gospel to every Creature.*: Secondly, a Promise, with a Commination, in the latter Verse, *He that believeth, and is Baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned.*

In the Precept, we have Two Particulars; First, a Mission; He sends them; *Go ye into all the World:* Secondly, a Commission; He authorizes them; *and preach the Gospel to every Creature.*

In the latter Verse, or Promise, we have, First, the *Thing* promised, laid down affirmatively, *shall be saved*; Secondly, the Qualification; and That, either, Absolute, *he that believeth*; or Conditional, *and is Baptized*; *He that believeth, and is Baptized, shall be saved*; Or a Commination, *shall be damned*, with

with a Qualification Negative, and Absolute, without any Limitation; *He, that believeth not, shall be damned.*

We will only hint at the Former Verse, for Introduction to the Latter. *And he said*, (that is Christ) Where observe; That it is only GOD; (that is CHRIST, GOD, and Man) that can give Mission, or Commission, to Preach, and ordain Sacraments. *Matt.* xxviii. 18. *All Power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth, Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations.* Go ye into all the *World*; There, is the Largeness of their Commission, *to all the World*, HERE; to all Nations, in St. *Matt.* Hence observe, The Apostles, and, by Them, the Evangelists, had an extraordinary Commission, which extended thro' the World; but our Commission, ordinarily, is *limited* to certain Places. True it is, there may be Itinerants, upon special Occasions; (and *they* also confined within their Verges). But, as Dr *Buckeridge* observes well; when CHRIST speakes to Apostles, he says, *Go Ye into* ALL *the* World; but, when to ordinary Pastors, and Teachers, ἔθηκε τινὰς, he *fixed* some to be Pastors, and some Teachers.

*And Preach the Gospel to every Creature*; There is the Commission; where, we have, First, the Act, *Preach*, that is, Proclaim: Secondly, the Object, or the *Gospel*; which, in the Original, and other Languages, signifies *Good News*, or a good Speech. From the Connexion, between the Mission and Commission, coming *from* the same Author, *Christ*, and extended *to* the same Persons, the *Apostles*, and their Successors, Observe; That none may Preach, as Church-Officers, but they, that are Sent, in a Gospel-Way. Our Adversary spoke so Home to This, that we need not press it further. The last Thing, is the Extent of the Commission; and that,

a very

a very large One; *unto every Creature*, as HERE; *to all Nations*, as in St. *Matthew*.

Now, the *Quære* will be, what is meant by *every Creature*? Some limit it to every *rational* Creature, Angels, Men, Devils; as *Origen*, and his *Misericordes Doctores*, who held, that the Devils, and Reprobates ſhould be ſaved; but That cannot be; for, 2 *Pet.* ii. 4. They *are caſt down to Hell—and reſerved unto Judgment*. Some reſtrain it only to Man, and That, when he is come to Age, and Underſtanding, excluding Children; this is too ſtrict. True it is, Infants are not Capable to be taught of MEN, but they may be taught of GOD: They cannot actually *underſtand* the Goſpel, but they may actually *receive* the *Benefit* of the Goſpel; a Nobleman's Child hath Intereſt in his Father's Patent, and Pardon; a Sucking Infant (though he *knows it not*) may, be joined in a Leaſe with the Parents. Some extend it (and it is conceived more fitly, according to the Letter) without any *Synecdoche*, or Figure, to every Creature; as if he ſhould ſay, Go, and proclaim the Benefit, that comes by CHRIST to every Creature; for, as by the firſt *Adam* ALL Creatures were accurſed; ſo, by CHRIST, the ſecond *Adam*, all Creatures ſhall be bleſſed, *Rom.* viii. 22. πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις, *For the whole Creation groaneth, &c.* Anſwerable to This, *Preach the Goſpel*, πᾶσῃ τῇ κτίσει, *to every Creature*, Telling them, That they are now, by CHRIST, to *be delivered from the Bondage— into the glorious Liberty of the Children of GOD*.

*Object.* But the Creature, cannot Hear, nor underſtand.

*Anſw.* It's true, not properly; no more could *John Baptiſt* in his Mother's Womb; and yet, ἐσκίρτησε τὸ βρέφος, *the Babe ſprang for Joy*: Nay, the Holy Ghoſt

Ghost ascribes a Hearing to the Creature, *Hosea* ii. 21. *And it shall come to pass in that Day, I will hear, saith the* LORD; *I will hear the Heavens, and they shall* hear *the Earth, and the Earth shall* hear *the Corn, and the Wine, and the Oil, and they shall hear* Jezreel. Hence observe, that every Creature, in some Sense, is sensible of the Benefit he hath by CHRIST: But every One in his Kind; Men, come to Years, and Discretion, are capable of *actual* Understanding, actual Profession, and actual Faith; Infants, are only Capable of the first *Seeds* of Understanding, and Profession of Faith, *in actu primo*; which will shew itself in the Fruits, when they come to Years. The *Rest* of our Fellow Creatures, as, by a natural Instinct, they groan because of the Curse; so, by another Instinct, they lift up their Heads in Expectation of the Blessing; and That, ἀποκαραδοκία, with an *earnest Expectation*, or, *a stretched out Neck*, as the Word in the Original signifies, *Rom.* viii. 19.

Thus we have Paraphras'd upon the First *verse*, for Introduction to the Second; wherein is, First, a Consolatory Promise, *He that believeth, and is Baptized, shall be saved*; Secondly, a Comminatory Curse, *He that Believeth not, shall be damned.* In the Former, we have, First, the Qualification; and That, either, Absolute, *he that believeth*; or Conditional, *and is Baptized.*

*Q.* Now, the *Quære* will be, What Belief is here meant?

*Sol.* First, the Event tells us, it is, That belief that *saves* Us, *he that believeth, shall be saved.* Secondly, the Opposition; it being contrary to that Unbelief, that Damns.——Observe. that a Saving Faith is necessary to Salvation; for without Faith it is impossible to please GOD; all They, and *only* they, that have a Saving Faith, shall be saved: So

that

that you ſee, that Faith is a Neceſſary, and abſolute Condition.

*And is Baptized*; *that is*, upon Suppoſition, if Baptiſm may be conveniently had. Hence obſerve, That Baptiſm is not abſolutely neceſſary, by Neceſſity of *Means*, (as they call it) as if None could be ſaved without it; but by Neceſſity of *Precept*; if conveniently it may be had. The *Iſraelites*, for forty Years in the Wilderneſs, were not Circumciſed. *Bernard*, who ſaw not All Things, yet, could ſee This, *viz.* that *non abſentia, ſed contemptus, Sacramenti, damnat*; *Not the Want, but the Contempt, of the Sacrament, damns*: *Valentinian*, the Emperor, died, as he was going to be Baptized in *Jordan*; and *Ambroſe*, being asked, what he thought of him? anſwered, That he was *Baptizatus voto, & voluntate, etiamſi, non reverà, aquæ lavacro*; *Baptized Inwardly with Wiſh, and Will, though not Outwardly with the Laver of Water*. *Auſtin* is conceived here to be *miſtaken*, who denied *Salvation* to Infants Un-Baptized; hence he is called, *durus Pater Infantum*, *A hard Father of Infants*: And many of the Doctors of the Church of *Rome*, who hold, That Infants, that die Un-Baptized, are kept in *limbo Infantum*, *In a Purgatory of Infants*, where they ſhall never behold the Beatifical Viſion.

*Object*. But here is placed, Firſt, Believing, and then, Baptized; ſo that, from the Order of placing the Words, ſome would gather, That we are, Firſt, to Believe, before we be Baptized.

*Anſw*. That will not follow; for in *Mark* i. 4. is placed, Firſt, Baptizing, and then, Preaching, and Repentance, after; Whence, they might as well gather, That we muſt be Baptized, before we can hear the Word Preached, or can Repent: Repentance, in Scripture, is oft placed before Faith; and yet, is a Fruit, and Effect *of* Faith. Some of the Evan-

 geliſts

gelists place *Judas*'s Receiving of the Sop, *before* the Sacrament, some *after* it. It is a Rule, in Interpreting of Holy Writ, That *Scriptura nescit prius, & posterius, The Scripture does not always observe the precise Order, in which Things were done.*

Q. But I beseech you to consider, What Faith it is, that is here meant?

*Answ.* A Saving Faith. Must, then, a Saving Faith be the Rule of our Baptism? And must we Baptize None, but those, we know to have a Saving Faith? Then we must Baptize None at all; never any Minister, upon that Ground, had ever a Commission to Baptize any; no not the Apostles: For *they* did not infallibly *know*, that those they Baptized had a Saving Faith; nay, they actually Baptized Many, that were Hypocrites, as *Simon Magus*, *Alexander*, *Hymeneus*, *Philetus*, and Others: Hence observe; That no Rule, for Baptizing, in General, can be gathered out of the Text; And to say, That None are to *be* Baptized, but they, that have a Saving Faith, which is the Faith that *is* only here meant; or that none, but they which make an Outward Profession of Faith, which is *not* here meant, is an Untruth not Gatherable from this Scripture, and an Adding to the Word of GOD; against which he hath proclaimed a solemn Curse.

The Commination, or Curse, follows in the last Words, *He that believeth not, shall be damned*; he doth not say, He, that is not Baptized, shall be damned:

For, tho' the Contempt of it is dangerous; yet, a Man may be saved without Baptism. He does not say, that he, that is not Dipped over Head, shall be damned; that's a Thing indifferent; for *any* Washing, *In the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, is Baptism: He does not say, that he that is not RE-baptized, or Baptized *again*, is

is damned; for That is the Invention of Man, never heard of (in *that* Sense) before *John* of *Leyden*'s Time; who confessed at his Execution, That he had That, and the Rest of his poisonous Doctrine, from Satan. Hence observe, That All Unbelievers, tho' Baptized, shall be damned; That all BElievers. tho' (thro' invincible Necessity) UN-Baptized, shall be saved. Thus we have given you the lively Meaning of the Holy Ghost in the Text.

Having laid this Foundation, we'll make further Enquiry into Two Things, which are in Controversy; First, What is meant by Baptism, or Baptizing? Secondly, Whether INFANTS ought to be Baptized, or not?

First, Baptism, in the Original, signifies nothing, but a *Washing*; as *Pareus*, upon the *Hebrews*, says, *Baptismus, Græcis, est quævis ablutio*; *Baptism is, in Greek, any Washing*; whether by Dipping, or Sprinkling: To Baptize is to Dip, or Sprinkle, says *Ravenel:* So says the Church's old Catechism; *Dipped, or Sprinkled, in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.* So the Directory, *Baptize the Child, by Pouring, or Sprinkling of the Water on the Face of the Child, without Adding any further Ceremony.* And, as many Kinds there are of Washing, so Many there are of Baptizing: Whereof, the Pillars of the Greek Tongue, *Hesichius, Budeus, Stephanus, Scapula, Arius Montanus, Pasor*, mention Four; First, *tingere*, to *dye*, or *tincture*; Secondly, *mergere*, to *drown*, or *plunge*; Thirdly, *madefacere*, to *wet*, or *moisten*; and lastly, *abluere*, to *wash*, or *cleanse*.

I confess, there are some, that distinguish between ῥαντίζειν, to *rantize* (as they call it) or sprinkle; δύνειν, which is to *plunge to the Bottom*; ἐπιπολάζειν, which is to *swim upon the Top*; βαπτίζειν, which is, as they criticise upon it, *to swim between the Top and Bottom*:

These

These Three Last are mentioned by *Casaubon* in his Notes upon the Third Chapter of St. *Matthew*, and were quoted by our Adversary; But, with what Fidelity, or Advantage to his Cause, I leave it to the Godly, and Learned to Judge; For he left out the last Words, wherein the whole State of the Question is determined by *Casaubon* against him: For thus he concludes, *horum sententia, jampridem merito est explosa*, &c. *The Judgment of those Men is deservedly long since exploded*, who would have Baptizing, to be, by Dipping. And he gives a Reason, *quum non in eo posita sit mysterii hujus vis*, & ἐνεργεια *Seeing the Force, and Efficacy of Baptism*, [This Mystery] *consists not in That*, i.e. in the Manner of Washing Which is confirm'd by *Aquinas*; *Immersio non est de necessitate Baptismi, Dipping is not of the Necessity of Baptism*: And also, by *Dominico Sotus*; *Ablutio est de essentiâ Baptismi, Washing is of the Essence* of Baptism; but the *Manner* of Washing, whether by Dipping, Pouring, or Sprinkling, is Accidental.

Many Places of Scripture confirm This; 1 *Cor.* x. 2. There the *Israelites were all Baptized in the* Red *Sea*, when their Feet did but touch the Water; not *as if* they were Baptized, when they were *not*, (as the *Anabaptists* gloss upon this Place) And that the *Egyptians* were *really*, Baptized; for the *Egyptians* were *not* Baptized, in their Sense; but *sank into the Bottom as a Stone*, *Exod.* xv. 5.

*Baptized in the Cloud*; not that the *Egyptians* WERE Baptized, and the *Israelites*, *as if* they were Baptized (as they discant) *in the Cloud*; for the *Egyptians* were not *under* the Cloud; for the *Israelites* went before the *Egyptians*: And as for the Cloud, Part of it was *over* the *Israelites*, Part of it went *before* them.

There is mention made in the Gospel of People's Baptizing, or Washing of themselves, when they

came

came from Market; as alſo of Cups, and of Pots, of Brazen Veſſels, and of Beds; which cannot be meant of *Plunging* in Water, ſo often, where that Element was ſo ſcarce; but *rinſing* [or Waſhing]

*John*'s Baptizing in *Jordan*, *Philip*'s Going down to the River with the *Eunuch*, prove nothing at all; For what ſtrange Conſequence would this be, eſpecially, from the *Anabaptiſts*, who muſt have expreſs Scripture for all Things; *John* Baptized in *Jordan*, *Philip* went down * into the Water with the *Eunuch*: Therefore, they were Dipped; ſeeing, it might as well be by Pouring, or Sprinkling, of Water upon them, for any Thing, that appears out of the Text?

* εἰς ὕδωρ, *or* to *the Water*.

*Object*. *John* Baptized in *Enon*; becauſe there was much Water.

*Anſw*. This will ſeem to be no Wonder in thoſe hot Countries, where there are many Miles without a Spring of Water; eſpecially, ſeeing Geographers, and Travellers tell us, that *Enon* is a little Brook ſcarce Knee deep, which one may ſtride over: and therefore, not fit for Dipping.

*Object*. But Baptiſm, *ſay they*, muſt reſemble the Death of CHRIST, *Rom*. vi. 4. *We are buried with him by Baptiſm*, which is not, by Sprinkling, but, by Dipping.

*Anſw*. The Scope of the Place is to ſhew, That One End of our Baptiſm is to Seal our Communion with CHRIST in his Death; but to preſs a Neceſſity of Reſemblance, by Deſcending into the Water, and Coming out again, we ſee no Ground in the Text; and if our Abiding *under* the Water, muſt anſwer CHRIST's Burial in exact Repreſentation; then, as CHRIST laid three Days, and three Nights in the Grave; ſo *They* muſt lie three

Days,

Days, and three Nights under the Water; which, if put in Execution, would ſoon end the Diſpute.

But *ſhould* we grant this Reſemblance; I appeal to any Man, whether *our* Pouring *on* of Water in Baptiſm, does not more reſemble our Chriſtian Burial, which is by Pouring *on* of Earth, or Duſt, than Plunging over Head?

Thus you ſee it proved, That Baptizing is *any* Kind of Waſhing, *In the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt.* We do not deny, That, if we were to Baptize converted Turks, or Pagans of Ripe Age, in hot Countries, we might Baptize *them* by Dipping; But to affirm, that no Baptiſm, but That, which *is by* Dipping, is lawful, is a Will-worſhip; much more, that Baptiſm adminiſtred otherwiſe, is a Nullity; and that thoſe, that *are* Baptized *ſo*, ought to be Baptized again, or Re-Baptized; which the Senate of *Syrick* underſtood well, when they made an Act, That All, that did preſume to Re-Baptize ſuch as were Baptized before, ſhould be drown'd.

And thus have we reſolved the Former Queſtion, *viz.* What is here meant by Baptiſm, or Baptizing? and That is, *not* Dipping *only*, but *any Waſhing*. And now we ſhall come to the Latter, *viz.* Whether Infants ought to be Baptized? And I beſeech you, Brethren, to give me Leave to ſpeak a little for Infants, thoſe poor Souls, who cannot ſpeak for Themſelves.

But before we come to the Queſtion, take with you theſe Two Conſiderations; Firſt, That thoſe Truths, that were not in Controverſy in the Primitive Times, the Apoſtles were not ſo punctual in preſſing of *them*; ſeeing there was no Need. *Solon*, being asked, Why he made no Law againſt Murderers of Parents? anſwered, Becauſe he conceiv'd none would Commit That unnatural Act. So if the

Apoſtles

Apoſtles had been asked, Why they did not mention Infant-Baptiſm in plainer Terms? I ſuppoſe, they would have anſwered, That they thought none would have denied it.

Secondly, Obſerve, That thoſe Things, that are preſſed, *often*, in the Old Teſtament, are mentioned more ſparingly in the New; as the Sabbath, and Magiſtracy: In the Old Teſtament, we have, concerning them, Line upon Line, and Precept upon Precept; but ſcarce a *Syllable* for a *Chriſtian* Sabbath, or a *Chriſtian* Magiſtracy, in the *New*. Nothing is more clear than Infants Church-Memberſhip in the Old Teſtament; therefore, not *ſo* clear in the New; and yet, clear enough to thoſe that have Eyes to ſee it, as will appear by theſe Reaſons following.

*Arg.* 1. They, who are in Covenant with GOD ought to have the *Seal* of the Covenant, which is Baptiſm;

But Infants of Believing Parents are in Covenant with GOD: Therefore, Infants of Believing Parents ought to have the Seal of the Covenant, Baptiſm.

The Former Propoſition is Firm, by the Confeſſion of All Divines; even of our Adverſaries. *Hæc eſt fundamentalis ratio pædobaptiſmi*, (ſays *Daneus*) *This is the Fundamental Reaſon of Baptizing of Infants, viz.* That They are in Covenant. *Eſſe fœderatum, ſufficit ad accipiendum* ſignum *fœderis*, (ſays *Davenant*) *To be in Covenant, is ſufficient to receive the* Sign, *and Seal of the Covenant. Omnes fœderati ſunt Baptizandi*, (ſays *Wendel*) *All that are in Covenant are to be Baptized. Si in fœdere ſunt, impiè agunt, qui eis* ſignum *fœderis negant*, (ſaith *Ferus*) *If they be in Covenant, they do wickedly, who deny them the* Sign *of the Covenant*. In a Civil Contract, (ſays Mr. *Perkins*) the Father and the Heir make but *one* Perſon;

Person; and the Covenant is for himself, and his Posterity.

The Minor Proposition, viz. That Infants of Believing Parents are in Covenant, is grounded on many Scriptures; as *Gen.* xvii. vii. Where GOD establishes a Covenant, not only with *Abraham*, but with his Seed *after* him in their Generations, for an Everlasting Covenant; *Everlasting*: and therefore to last to the End of the World; as *Cornelius à Lapide* says, *absolutè æternum est, in semine spirituali, fidelibus*; *It is absolutely Everlasting in the Spiritual Seed to the Faithful.* Gal. iii. 8. *The Scripture foreseeing that GOD would justify the Heathen through Faith, preached before the Gospel unto* Abraham; Therefore, if *Isaac* was in Covenant with his Father, when he was but Eight Days old, and had the *Seal* by Virtue of the Lamb to *be* slain; much more are the Children of Believing Parents intitled to it, by Virtue of the Lamb that *is already* slain. *Deut.* xxix. 11. When all the People stood before the LORD, to enter into Covenant with him, their LITTLE ONES are mentioned amongst the Rest: which is further confirmed, *Acts* ii. 38, 39. *Be Baptized every one of you —— for the Promise is to you, and to your Children.* To say that the Children were not yet Believers, is but a Shift; for the Text makes it clear, that as soon as the Parents were Believers, their Children were in Covenant with them, and to be Baptized.

*Arg.* 2. Such as were Circumcised under the Law, may be Baptized under the Gospel.

But Infants of Believers were Circumcised under the Law. Therefore they may be Baptised under the Gospel.

*Huic Argumento non Omnes Anabaptistæ resistent*, (says learned *Whitaker*) *All the Anabaptists shall not be able to resist this Argument.* The Minor, *viz.*

The

That Infants under the Law were Circumcised, is confessed.

The Former Proposition is only questioned, *viz.* That the Baptism of Infants under the Gospel does not necessarily follow from Circumcision under the Law. But *Augustin* is clear for it, saying, *Mutatis signis, manet eadem gratia, sine ætatis discrimine: The Outward Visible Signs being changed, the same Grace remains without any Difference of Age.* And he gives a Reason, *viz.* Because the Grace of GOD is not straighter under the New Testament Dispensation, than under That of the Old: Nay, CHRIST *Heb.* viii. 6. Is said to be a Mediator of a *better* Covenant; but how is it a better Covenant, if all poor Infants, that were *in* Covenant under the Law, are *out* of Covenant under the Gospel? *Tit.* ii. 11. *The Grace of GOD—hath appeared unto All*; and therefore, surely unto Infants; as *Ireneus* says; *Christus pro parvulis, parvulus factus est*, &c. *CHRIST became a Little One, for Little Ones Sake, that he might redeem the Little Ones.* Little Ones were the first Martyrs that suffered for CHRIST; *in Rama, was a Voice heard.* And that Baptism came in the Room of Circumcision, the Apostle clears, *Col.* ii. 11, 12. *Ye are circumcised with the Circumcision made without Hands* [called there also, *The Circumcision of CHRIST, i. e.* appointed *by* CHRIST instead of Circumcision: But how is that? By being *Buried with him in Baptism.* Hence arises another Argument.

*Arg.* 3. Those, that were once *in* Covenant; had the *Seal* of the Covenant, and were never Disfranchized, and put *out* of Covenant, have a Title to the Covenant, and Seal of it still.

But Infants were once *in* Covenant, had the *Seal* of the Covenant, and were never disfranchized, and put *out* of Covenant. Therefore Infants, have Title to the Covenant, and Seal of it still.

Let any Man ſhew One Syllable, One Tittle in Scripture, That ever Infants were put Out, and we'll yield the *Gantlet*; nay, the Goſpel is ſo far from ſaying, That they are put Out, that it gives them large Commendations, beyond them of Riper Years; making them the Rule of our Perfection: *As New-born-Babes deſire the ſincere Milk of the Word. Except ye be converted, and become as Little Children, ye ſhall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*; Which is a Caſe ſo clear, that even *Bellarmine* concludes, *Nullum eſt impedimentum, &c. There is nothing that hinders, but that Infants may as well be Baptized under the Goſpel, as they were Circumciſed under the Law; for neither hath GOD forbidden Miniſters to give them the Sacrament, neither are They Uncapable to receive it.*

*Arg.* 4. That, which GOD hath commanded, may lawfully be practiſed by the Miniſters of JESUS CHRIST.

Bur GOD hath commanded Infant-Baptiſm: Therefore, it may lawfully be practiſed by the Miniſters of JESUS CHRIST. That GOD hath commanded it, appears from *Matt.* xxviii. 19. *Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, Baptizing them,* [ALL]. It is a general Command; and, as *Aquinas* ſays, *poſito generali mandato, pars ejus negari non poteſt, A general Command being given, no Part of it can be denied:* Infants are a Part of Nations; and Therefore, included in them.

*Object.* But here is no *mention* made of Infants.

*Anſw.* No, nor of them of Age. Generals include Particulars in all Laws; *Pſ.* cxvii. *Praiſe the Lord all ye Nations.* NATIONS includes Old Men, and Babes, Young Men, and Maidens, ALL, without Exception, as another Pſalm interprets it.

Now, if Infants are excepted, contrary to that Saying of St. *Ambroſe, Qui dixit OMNES, nullum*

*excepit*

*excepit, neq; parvulos*, &c. *He that commanded ALL to be Baptized, excepted none, no, not Litsle Ones*; If (I ſay) they are excepted, it is, either, becauſe they are not Named; or, becauſe we never read in Scripture, that any Infants were Baptized; or, becauſe they are not Capable; (that *fourth* Cavil, being the ſame with the Third, I'll take away anon) but for None of theſe Three; Therefore, Infants are not excepted from Baptiſm.

Not for the Firſt, *viz.* Becauſe they are not *Named*; for ſo, neither old Men, nor Nobles, nor Miniſters are *named*. Not for the Second, *viz.* Becauſe we *Read* not of their Baptiſm; for ſo, we neither read of the Baptiſm of the Apoſtles, nor of the Virgin *Mary*; yet we piouſly believe, That they were Baptized; *De negatione facti, ad jus non valet conſequentia*; *Such a Thing is not mentioned, that it* WAS *done*; *therefore it was* NOT *done, or ought not to* BE *done, is no Conſequence*; CHRIST did, and ſaid, many Things that are not written; ſo did his Apoſtles.

Not for the Third, viz. Becauſe they are *Uncapable*; which is denied: For if Infants are Uncapable, it is, EITHER, Becauſe they have no Repentance, and Faith in Act; But That cannot hinder them: For CHRIST was Baptized; yet, had no Repentance; For he had no Sin to repent of: Had no Faith: For Faith preſuppoſeth one loſt in Himſelf, and who depends upon another for Salvation; (CHRIST Himſelf being that Rock of Salvation, upon whom all Mankind, being loſt, depend) OR, Becauſe they cannot hear the Word preached; But if ſo, they, that are Deaf, ſhould be excluded from Baptiſm: OR, Becauſe they they are not ſome *Other* Way qualified; But That cannot hinder them: For GOD requires no more of them, that are in Covenant, and born of Believing Parents, but a pure Capacity, and Receptability; which Divines call, *Potentiam objec-*

*tivam.* As GOD, in the Beginning, created the World of *Nothing*; so, in the Beginning of the New Creature, he does Regenerate, and Re-create us of *Nothing*. Upon this Account it is, that we read of many whole Families Baptized; not EXcluding, but rather INcluding, Infants. *Cornelius* was Baptized with his Houshold, *Acts* x. 47, 48. *Lydia*, and her *Houshold Acts* xvi. 15. *Crispus* and ALL his *House*, *Acts* xviii 8 And the *Houshold of Stephanus*, 1 *Cor.* i. 16. The Jaylor, καὶ οἱ αὐτοῦ πάντες, ALL that were His, *Acts* xvi. 33. His Servants, his Children, &c. For can we imagine, that so many Families were without a Child. ?

*Arg* 5. They, that are Capable of the Kingdom, and of the Blessing, which is the Greater, are Capable of Baptism, which is the Lesser.

But Infants are Capable of the Kingdom, and of the Blessing, which is the Greater.

Therefore, they are Capable of Baptism which is the Lesser. *Suffer the Little Children to come unto me, and* forbid *them not*; *for of such is the Kingdom of GOD*, (says our Saviour) And surely, If the Kingdom of GOD receives them, the Church cannot exclude them; for the Church *must* receive such, as Glory receives; for *Acts* ii. 47. *The Lord added to the Church daily* [i. e. admitted *into* the Church by Baptism] *such as should be* saved. Now for Proof of this Argument, take these Places, *Mark* x. 3. to 17. ix 36, 37. *Matt.* xviii. 2, 3, 4. xix. 13 14, 15. *Luke* ix. 47, 48. *Luke* xviii. 15, 16. All which, tho' spoke upon several Occasions; yet, prove Infants to be Church-members, and Capable, both of Grace, and Glory. We'll instance in a few. *Matt.* xviii. 2, 3, 4. *Jesus called a Little Child unto him*, (the Word is παιδίον; which, (as *Hippocrates* in his Distinction of Ages says, and *Beza*, who seconds him) signifies a Child under seven Years of Age) *and*

*set*

*set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as Little Children, i. e.* Endeavour to be free from actual Sin, as They are *ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven* Another is That of St. *Luke* xviii. 16. Wherein, Observe, First, a Precept, *Suffer Little Children to come unto me.*

Secondly, a Prohibition, *And forbid them not.*

Thirdly, his Displeasure against his Disciples, for Hindring them *to* come to him; for he looked on this Act with Indignation, and *was much displeased* at it. *Mark* x. 14.

Fourthly, he adds, a Reason, *Why* Little Ones should be brought to him; *For of such is the Kingdom of GOD, Mark* x. 14. i. e. The Kingdom of Grace here, and of Glory hereafter: They are visible Members of his Church, and of his Kingdom; and therefore, None can hinder their Access to him.

Fifthly, He confirms this Reason, *à majori*, viz. *from the Greater to the Lesser*; GOD's Kingdom doth, not only, *belong* to Infants; but I will tell you more; Whosoever will come into this Kingdom, must *Resemble* Infants, in Innocency, in Humility, and Simplicity. *Matt.* xviii. 3, 4.

Sixthly, He adds his Benediction of Them; *He took them up in his Arms, put his Hands upon them, and blessed them Mark* x. 16. and tells us, *Matt.* xviii 10. *That in Heaven their Angels do always behold the Face of my Father which is in Heaven*; Together with the Danger they are Obnoxious to, *who shall offend one of these Little Ones, verse 6.* And All This recorded by three Evangelists. *Matthew, Mark,* and *Luke,* as if it were, of *Purpose* to check the Sacrilegious Insolency of these latter Times, that deny them the Seal. CHRIST is not more punctual by his Spirit, in declaring his *own* Birth

Birth, Passion, Resurrection, &c. than he is in this precious *Truth*, so much trampled under Foot.

And if any Object, That these were not young Children, the Text easily confutes them: For they were παιδία, *Children* under Seven Years of Age; βρέφη, *Children* that could scarce Speak; And they did not *lead* them, but προσέφερον, *Carried* them unto him. CHRIST is said *twice* in St. *Mark* ἐναγκαλισάμενος, *To take them up in his Arms, and embrace them.* CHRIST was already Instructing the People, that were able to understand; the Apostles were offended for bringing of Children, who could *not* understand.

Well then; Doth CHRIST take Children in his Arms, and would he have them *all* put out of his visible Church? Would he have us receive them in his *Name*; and yet, not to receive them into his visible *Church*, nor as his Disciples? How can Infants be received in CHRIST's Name, if they belong not visibly to Him, and his Church? Nay, doth CHRIST account it a Receiving of *himself*; and shall we refuse to receive them, or acknowledge them the *Subjects* of his visible Kingdom? Will it not follow then, That whosoever Refuseth them, RefusethCHRIST, and Him that sent him? For my Part (to use the Words of a Godly, and learned Divine) Seeing, the Will of CHRIST is That Rule I must walk by, and his Word, That which I must be judged by; and that he hath given me so full a Discovery of his Will in this Point; I will boldly adventure to follow his Rule; and had rather answer him, upon his own Encouragement, for admitting an Hundred Infants *into* his Church, than answer for keeping *out* of One.

*Arg. 6.* All Disciples may be Baptized.
But Infants of Believing Parents are Disciples;
Therefore some Infants may be Baptized.

The

The Major, or Former Proposition, is granted by our Adversaries, who translate that Place, *Matt.* xxviii. 19. μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, *Go, make* Disciples of *all Nations*; which, in our last Translation, is, *Go*, Teach *all Nations*; confessing, That as soon as they are Disciples, they may be Baptized.

Now for the Minor, *viz.* That Infants are Disciples, is evident from *Acts* xv. 10. *Why tempt ye God, to put a Yoak upon the Neck of the Disciples?* This Yoak was Circumcision: as will appear, by Comparing it with the fifth Verse, and the Context, from the Beginning of the Chapter. Now, amongst the *Jews*, Children *only* were to be Circumcised; and, amongst the *Gentiles*, Children *together with* Parents, when they were Converted, and became Proselytes. To say, That, not only Circumcision, but the Doctrine, and Observation of the whole Law, is meant by the Yoak, is but a Shift: For Circumcision was the *Seal*, or Ordinance, by which the Jews were bound to observe the Doctrine, and the Law; and all those, upon whom the Yoak was laid by Circumcision, are called Disciples; whereof, Infants were a great Part.

And if it be Objected, That Children are not Capable of Instruction; as it is Nothing to the Purpose, so it contradicts Scripture, *Isa.* liv. 13. *And all thy Children shall be taught of the Lord, and great shall be the Peace of thy Children.* And if any *Carnally* interpret this of the *Jews* Return from Captivity, as they do other Places of *Isa.* our Saviour checks them, *John* vi. 45. And *It is written in the Prophets, And they shall be all taught of GOD.*

*Arg.* 7. All, that have Faith, may be Baptized;
But some Infants have Faith: Therefore, some Infants may be Baptized.

The Proposition, None will deny; the Minor may be proved by several Reasons.

First,

First, CHRIST, expresly, calls them Believers, *Matt.* xviii. 6. [for tho' the Text means the Disciples, as Believers *in facto*; yet, it is to be understood also of Children, as Such *in fieri*: Else, they could not, in any Sense, be Patterns for the Disciples Faith. *vid. Pa.* 48. 52.] He attributes Humility to them, and Faith, *v.* 4. and commands Elders to imitate them, *v.* 3. and that you may see they were Infants, *Mark cap.* ix. 36. tells us they were such as CHRIST *took up in his Arms.*

Secondly, They are said to receive the Kingdom of GOD, *Mark* x. *that is*, the Grace of GOD, Remission of Sins, and Life Eternal. Now, the Kingdom of GOD is not received, but by Faith in CHRIST.

Thirdly, They Please GOD; therefore Christ Blesseth them; but, without Faith, it is *impossible* to please GOD.

Fourthly, Either Faith must be Allowed them, or Salvation Denied them; but the Latter is Cruel, and Impious; therefore, the Former must be Godly, and Pious. Faith *only* purifies the Heart; but no unclean Thing shall enter into Heaven.

Fifthly, Tho' Infants cannot make actual Profession of Faith; yet they may have Inward *Roots* of Sanctification, *and* Faith.

*John Baptist* and *Jeremiah* were sanctified in their Mothers Wombs. Let *Carnalists* say what they please, That is the principal Meaning of that Place, *Isa.* 65. 20. *There shall be no more thence an Infant of Days.* The *Jews* thought they were not sanctified, unless a Sabbath went over them; *The Child shall die an Hundred Years old*; *that is*, as well in Covenant with God, or, as Visible a Church-Member, *as if* he were a Hundred Years old. Therefore *Pareus* says, *Infantes Ecclesiæ, etiam ante Baptismum, censentur fideles*; *Infants of the Church, even*

before

before *Baptism, are judged faithful. Hommius* says, Infants have Faith, *in semine, In the Seed*; tho' not *in messe, In the Harvest. Beza* says, They have Faith δυνάμει, *In Power*; tho not in ἐνεργεία, *In Operation.* Faith, says *Trelcatius*, is Twofold;

1. Active; which the Elder have by Hearing the Word.

2. Passive, and by Imputation; which Infants have by Virtue of the Covenant, and Divine Promise. *Pelagius* asks *Austin*, where he places Infants Baptized? He answers, *in numero credentium, IN the Number of Believers*; and adds, *nec judicare ullo modo aliter audebis, si non vis esse* aperte *hæreticus, Neither mayst thou presume to judge otherwise, if thou wilt not be a* plain *Heretick.* We'll conclude this with That of *Vossius*; As in Naturals, so in Supernaturals, we must distinguish between these Three Things, *viz.* Power, Habit, and Act; The Power of Reasoning is in Infants, the Habit, in Men, Sleeping; but the Act, and Exercise, in them that are Waking; The Power answers the Seed; The Habit, the Tree; The Act and Exercise, the Fruit: The *Seed* of Faith may be in Infants; The Habit in Men of Age; but the Act and Exercise, in them that work *according* to the Habit.

8. *Arg.* They that are Holy, with a Covenant-Holiness, may be Baptized; But Infants of Believing Parents are Holy with a Covenant-Holiness: Therefore, Infants of Believing Parents may be Baptized. For the Former Proposition, *fœderatis competit* SIGNUM *fœderis*, (says *Vossius*) *The* Sign *of the Covenant belongs to them that are in Covenant.* Holiness is Twofold (says *Bullinger*) either, of Faith, or, of the Covenant. *Ezra.* ix. 2. *The Holy Seed*, i. e. They that were in Covenant, *have mingled themselves with the People of the Lands*, i. e. the Nations, or them that were *out* of

Covenant. Thus you ſee, that Covenant-Holineſs is no *Gibberiſh*, but Grounded upon Scripture, and avouched by learned Men: As ſhall more fully appear.

The Minor, *viz.* That Children of Believing Parents are Holy with a Covenant-Holineſs, is clear from 1 *Cor.* vii. 14. *Elſe were your Children Unclean*, i. e. *not* in Covenant, *but now they are Holy*, i. e. *in* Covenant. Thus (beſides the Antients) *Sharpius*, and *Peter Martyr* interpret it; and *Hugo Grotius* ſays, *Non loquitur Apoſtolus de Sanctitate naturali*, &c. *The Apoſtle ſpeaks not of natural Holineſs*, and *inhering* to the Nature of Children; but of an Holineſs *adhering* to them; *that is*, the Holineſs of the Covenant: for the Children of Believers are comprehended in the Covenant of Grace; and therefore, accounted Holy by GOD. To interpret it, (as the groſs *Anabaptiſts* do) That they are Holy, *that is*, no *Baſtards*, is a New Holineſs, not heard of in Scripture; and, as Doctor *Featly* ſays, *a Baſtard Expoſition*: And *Pareus* gives the Reaſon; *If the Children of Believers be therefore Holy, becauſe they are no Baſtards, the Children of Pagans are as Holy as they*; *for* they *alſo are no Baſtards. If the Firſt Fruits be Holy, the Lump is alſo Holy*; *and if the Root be Holy, ſo are the Branches. Rom.* xi. 16. The Firſt Fruits and the Root, are the Parents; the Lump are the Branches; *that is*, the Children, and Poſterity.

And, as in *verſe* 17. If the *Jews* were broken off, and the *Gentiles* graffed into their Place; it will follow, That, if the *Jews* were broken *off*, Parents with Children, then the *Gentiles* ſhall be graffed *in*, Parents with Children;

But the *Jews* were broken off Parents with Children: Therefore the *Gentiles* ſhall be graffed in, Parents with Children.

9. *Arg.* If Infants ſhould be out of Covenant under the Goſpel, many dangerous Abſurdities would follow.

Firſt, Infants would be Loſers by the Coming of CHRIST, and be put in a worſe Condition than the *Jewiſh* Infants were: They, *with* the Parents, were admitted to the Seal of the Covenant, which was Circumciſion; and why not Children, *with* Parents, to Baptiſm?

Secondly, If Infants ſhould be in Covenant Then, and not Now, Grace would be Larger under the Law, than under the Goſpel.

Thirdly; There would be no Difference between the Child of a Chriſtian, and the Child of a Pagan; but all the Infants of Chriſtians would be as vile as the Children of *Turks*, *Tartars*, or *Cannibals*.

Fourthly, they would be without GOD, without CHRIST, without Hope in the World; Not the Children of GOD, but of the Devil; would all be damned: For out of Covenant, and the viſible Church, (ordinarily) there is no Salvation: [For GOD *ADDS to the Church ſuch as* ſhall *be ſaved.*]

10. *Arg.* Laſtly, That, which hath continued ſince the Apoſtles Times, with Bleſſed Succeſs, muſt needs be Lawful;

But Infant-Baptiſm hath continued with Bleſſed Succeſs, ſince the Apoſtles Times:

Therefore, Infant-Baptiſm is Lawful.

We'll begin with the Firſt Century, or Hundred Years after CHRIST. *Dionyſius* the Areopagite, whom the Apoſtles converted at *Athens*, ſays, *Holy Men have received a Tradition from the Fathers*, i.e. *the Apoſtles, to Baptize Infants.* *Clemens* (who is recorded, by ſome of the Antients, to ſucceed *Peter* in his Miniſtry at *Rome*) ſays Βαπτίζετε ὑμῶν τὰ νηπιά, *Baptiſe your Infants.*

*Ireneus*

*Irenæus* (who lived in the Second Century) says, *Christus pro parvulis parvulus factus est, CHRIST became a Little One for Little Ones Sake, that Little Ones might be received into Covenant*

*Origen*, (who lived in the Beginning of the Third Century) says, *The Church received a Tradition from the Apostles to Baptize Infants*; and gives a Reason, *viz.* Because they are Born in Impurity of Sin. Nay, *Pelagius*, a great Scholar, who lived in the latter End of this Century, though he denied Original Sin, yet confessed Infant-Baptism: For when they press'd him with this Question; *If Infants have not Original Sin, what Need have they of Baptism?* He answered, *That CHRIST appointed, and the Church practised Infant-Baptism, not to purge past Sin; but to prevent it for the Time to come.*

*Cyprian*, in the Fourth Century, confirms it in his Epistle to *Fidus*; and gives an Account of a Council of Sixty-six Bishops, who decreed, That *Infants should be Baptized. Ambrose* says, *Because every Age is liable to Sin, therefore every Age is fit for the Sacrament of Baptism. Nazianzene* says, *It is better to seal Infants with Baptism, (tho' they know it not)* than to leave them UNSealed. *Austin* is conceived to go *too* far, who denied a Possibility of Salvation to them, that died Unbaptized; pressing that Place *John* iii. 5. *Except a Man be Born of Water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of GOD.*

The *Millevitan* Council, in the Fifth Century, Decreed, *That whosoever should deny, that Infants, (even taken from their Mothers Wombs) might not be Baptized, should be accursed.* All Churches, All Ages since, agree in This: The Harmonies of Confessions of all Reformed Churches; The Church of *England* in the Apology; The Old Catechism; The Twenty-Seventh Article; The Directory; the

The Greater, and Lesser Catechism, composed by the Assembly of Divines; The late Parliament by a further Declaration; A L L confirm it. The Canons of our Church did, not only, in Former Times, Declare, but the Laws of our Land did Punish *Anabaptists* as Hereticks. Mr. *Fox*, in his *Acts and Monuments*, approves of the *Albigenses*, *Waldenses*, *Wickliffists*, *Lollards*, Poor Men of *Lyons*, *Brownists*, *Barrowists*, as Members of the Reformed Churches, but *Wholly* excludes the *Anabaptists*, as erring Fundamentally.

I'll say no more for Confirmation of this Polemical Discourse, but Wind up all with a Word of Exhortation. I beseech you, Brethren, consider what a dangerous Error this is, that robs the Scripture of it's Truth, Infants of their Right, Parents of their Comforts, the Church of it's Members, CHRIST of his Merits, and GOD of his Glory. It is also the Mother of many *Other* Errors: Hence sprung the *Ranters*, *Socinians*, *Antitrinitarians*, *Shakers*, *Levellers*, They that are above Ordinances, *Antiscripturians*; An Error, that G O D hath expressed many signal Judgments against; as *Sleiden*, and *Gastius*, in *Germany*, and some of our Worthies in *England*, have declared.

Secondly, Consider, That much Benefit redounds, both to Parents, and Children, by Infant-Baptism.

First, Much Comfort comes hereby to the Parents, when they consider G O D's Free Grace to Them, and Theirs; That *He is not ashamed to be called their GOD, and the GOD of their Seed after them. Heb.* xi. 16.

Secondly, Much Benefit comes to Infants by Baptism: For they are thereby Admitted into the Bosom of the Church; Devoted, and Consecrated unto GOD; His Name is put upon them; They Wear

Wear his Royal Badge; and, by it, they are distinguished from *Heathens*. And this is so clear from Scripture, truly, and spiritually understood, *That the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.*

Now, the GOD of Peace and Truth, by his Spirit, lead us into All Truth; keep us Pure, and Unspotted in this Hour of *England's* Temptation, and Trial; and keep us Faithful to the Death, that so, we may receive a Crown of Life.

Δόξα μόνῳ τῷ Θεῷ.

*FINIS.*

---

## *ERRATA.*

PAGE 8, Line 11, *deest* T. *for* Tombs. *p.* 10. *l.* 32. *for* Enjoying, *read* Enjoyment. *p.* 11. *l.* 13. *for* Enterance, *r.* Entrance. *p.* 13. *l.* 6. *for* Circumcision, *r.* Circumcision. *p.* 16. *l.* 26. *for* Batized, *r.* Baptized. *p.* 19. *l.* 6. C. *for* Cragge. *p.* 24. *l.* 20. *for* Thetefore, *r.* Therefore. *p.* 29. *l.* 27. *for* Engrafted, *r.* Engraffed. *ibid. l.* 30. *for* Ingrafted, *r.* Engraffed. *p.* 30. *l.* 23, 25, & 28. *for* Hester, *r* Esther. *p.* 31. *l.* 6. *for* Ingrafting, *r.* Engraffing. *p.* 48. *l.* 9. *r. The* Lawfully begotten *Jews.* *p.* 51. *l.* 25. *deest* I. *p.* 52. *l.* 3. *r. In* the sixth Verse.

*If any more ERRATA's have escaped Observation, the Reader is desired to correct them with his Pen.*